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Abstract

This thesis offers an examination and analysis of the manuscript compilation of three poems: Judgement Day I, Resignation A and Resignation B (ff.115v-19v) found in Exeter Cathedral Library MS 3501. It argues that paratextual information including textual division, subordination and manuscript layout are indicative of compiler intention and are significant in the interpretation and subsequent editing practice of Old English texts. An examination of other Old English manuscripts reveals that compilation of this sort was not uncommon; this compilation is indicative of the intended function of the poems as conceived by the manuscript compiler. Evidence from Old English homilies provides a context for the compilation of JDayI with ResA and ResB, where the poems can be seen to share themes common to sets of Rogationtide homilies. An analysis of the use of textual division markers found throughout the Exeter Book manuscript is also provided.

This thesis is divided into five main sections: methodology; thematic evidence; contextual evidence; manuscript evidence; and a transcription of JDayI, ResA and ResB. Section I presents the methodology which informs this study, examining the significance of manuscript context in the interpretation and editorial practice of Old English poetry; it also provides an editorial rationale for the semi-diplomatic transcription of Section V. Section II: Thematic Evidence provides an individual review of each poem’s critical history, genre classification and literary analysis, and re-evaluates the poems anew. Section III: Contextual Evidence brings together the thematic evidence of Section II to argue the poems were compiled together in the Exeter Book because they reflected themes common to Rogationtide homilies. Using evidence of similar manuscript compilation in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 201 (CCCC 201) and in the Vercelli Homilies (specifically VercHomXIX-XXI) it is argued the three Exeter Book poems were placed together for use during Rogationtide, and thereby designed to promote compunction, confession and penance among the audience. Section IV: Manuscript Evidence examines the layout and textual division of these three texts and results displaying the textual division and subordination practice found throughout the Exeter Book manuscript are provided. Finally, Section V: Transcription presents a diplomatic transcription of the texts with facing facsimile image to reflect their manuscript context.

The original contributions of this thesis are therefore twofold:

i. It presents original data and analysis of textual division practice used in the Exeter Book manuscript

ii. It provides thematic, contextual and manuscript evidence of manuscript compilation of JDayI, ResA and ResB and provides an explanation of the purpose such compilation sought to offer.
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<tr>
<td>SouI</td>
<td>Soul and Body I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SouII</td>
<td>Soul and Body II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summons</td>
<td>A Summons to Prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vain</td>
<td>Vainglory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wan</td>
<td>Wanderer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whale</td>
<td>Whale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wid</td>
<td>Widsith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>Wife’s Lament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulf</td>
<td>Wulf and Eadwacer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Prose Texts

| ÆCH | Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies | HGl | Harley Glossary |
| ÆHom | Homilies of Ælfric | VercHom | Vercelli Homilies |
| BlHom | Blickling Homilies | WHom | Wulfstan’s Homilies |

## Journals

| AnM | Annuale Medievale | NQ | Notes and Queries |
| ASE | Anglo-Saxon England | PMLA | Publications of the Modern Language Association of America |
| ES | English Studies | PQ | Philological Quarterly |
| JEGP | Journal of English and Germanic Philology | YES | Yearbook of English Studies |
| MLR | Modern Language Review | | |

## Other

| ACMRS | Arizona Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies |
| BT | Bosworth-Toller Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon |
| CH | Clark-Hall Old English Dictionary |
| COE | Old English Corpus |
| DOE | Dictionary of Old English |
| EETS | Early English Text Society |
| KCLMS | King’s College London Medieval Studies |
| TOE | Thesaurus of Old English |
~ For My Family ~
Introduction

Manuscripts can be studied in a number of ways: as objects of material culture; as witnesses to the intellectual preoccupations of the scholars who compiled and copied them; and by a combination of their physical appearance and the texts they contain to uncover the reasons these collections of texts were first compiled (Gretsch 2003: 111).\(^1\) This thesis contributes to this scholarship by presenting an examination and analysis of the manuscript compilation of three Old English poems: *Judgement Day I*, *Resignation A* and *Resignation B* (ff.115v-19v) found in Exeter Cathedral Library MS 3501.\(^2\) It argues that paratextual information\(^3\) including textual division, subordination and manuscript layout are indicative of compiler intention and are significant in the interpretation and subsequent editing practice of Old English texts. Further, an examination of other Old English manuscripts reveals that compilation of this sort was not uncommon, and indicates the intended function of the poems, as conceived by the manuscript compiler. Previous scholarship has commented that poems at this point in the manuscript (*JDayI – HomFrII*)\(^4\) each contain content which relates to the Easter season (Whitbread 1948; Anderson 1986; Lochrie 1986b; Muir 2000). I argue that evidence from Old English homilies provides a context for the compilation of *JDayI* with *ResA* and *ResB*; the poems can be seen to share themes common to homilies designed for use during Rogationtide (i.e. the three days leading up to the Feast of the Ascension). Each of the poems individually relates to a number of associated topics: Judgement Day, the fate and care of the soul, spiritual despair, penance, and confession. Specific devotional exercises designed to induce compunction and self-awareness among the audience well fit the context of confession, penance and care for the soul reflected in the compilation of other manuscripts.\(^5\) It is within this tradition that *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB* can best

---

1 Gretsch makes this observation in relation to the manuscript compilation of MS CCCC 57, which is the focus of Ker (1957), item 116.
2 The term *paratext* as used by Genette in his 1991 article describes the additional information such as title, author’s name and so forth which ‘make a text present’ (1991: 261). I here use this term to refer to the manuscript information outlined above.
3 Short titles used throughout this thesis are based on those of Mitchell et al. (1976: 207-221).
4 Compare, for example: VercHomIX and XIX-XXI (s. X\(^2\)); Oxford Bodleian Library Hatton 113 9(spec. WHomXXIX f.68r-70v (s. XI\(^2\)); CCCC 201 (s. XI); Oxford Bodleian Library, MS Laud Miscellanous 482 (s. XI) *inter alia*. These manuscripts are also included in discussion in Section III: Contextual Evidence. For an analysis of the last of these manuscripts, see Thompson (2005: 106-20).
be understood: rather than being confused texts that sit uncomfortably within their respective genres of Judgement Day poetry and elegy, these poems were brought together by the manuscript compiler to serve the purpose of preparing the soul for death and the afterlife.

Thesis Structure
This thesis is divided into five sections: methodology; thematic evidence; contextual evidence; manuscript evidence; and finally a transcription of JDayI, ResA and ResB.

Section I (p. 4ff) provides the methodology which informs this study, examining the significance of manuscript context in the interpretation and editorial practice of Old English poetry, and provides an editorial rationale for the transcription of Section V. Section II: Thematic Evidence (p. 16ff) provides an individual review of each poem’s critical history, genre classification and literary analysis, and re-evaluates the poems anew, while Section III: Contextual Evidence (p. 73ff) brings together the thematic evidence of Section II to argue that the poems were compiled together in the Exeter Book as they reflected themes common to Rogationtide homilies. By using evidence of similar manuscript compilation in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 201 (CCCC 201) and in the Vercelli Homilies (specifically VercHomXIX-XXI), I argue these poems were placed together for use during the period of Rogation, and designed to promote compunction, and therefore confession and penance, among the audience.

Section IV: Manuscript Evidence (p. 104ff) examines manuscript information indicative of compilation through the layout and textual division of these three texts. Original paratextual evidence has been gathered detailing the textual division and subordination practice found throughout the Exeter Book manuscript; this Section includes an examination and analysis of these data. Four case studies are also offered in this section to contextualise the use of division markers found between JDayI, ResA and ResB.

---

6 Ker (1957), item 49.
7 Ker (1957), item 394.
Finally, Section V: Transcription (p. 163ff) presents a diplomatic transcription of the three texts set out to reflect their manuscript context; this Section opens with an introduction discussing the Exeter Book manuscript, including script, provenance, damage and layout. It is the intention of this transcription to convey as transparently as possible the abstraction of the poems from manuscript to print; the layout of the transcription and the relationship of the poems to one another has been designed to reflect their manuscript context and to emphasise the importance of paratextual information, often lost in the transition from script to print. Facsimile images of the manuscript are therefore presented with a facing diplomatic transcription (p. 177ff). Codicological annotation taken during an examination of the Exeter Book in July 2007 accompanies the transcription (p. 196ff). Tables supplying the textual division, subordination and final punctuation data alongside results of a relevant study by Cavill (1985: 157) are provided as Appendices to the thesis.
Section I

Methodology

1.1 Manuscript Compilation and the Editing of Old English Texts

Attention to the single manuscript as historical artefact has become the subject of much recent scholarship (see, for example: Robinson and Zim (eds.) 1997; Kelly and Thompson (eds.) 2005; Minnis and Roberts (eds.) 2007). This investigation goes beyond traditional textual criticism arguing that the individual manuscript contextually the text(s) it contains in specific ways [and seeks to] analyse the consequences of this relationship on the way these texts may be read and interpreted. More particularly, it postulates the possibility that a given manuscript, having been organised along certain principles, may well present its text(s) according to its own agenda [...] Far from being a transparent or neutral vehicle, the codex can have a typological identity that affects the way we read and understand the texts it presents. (Nichols and Wenzel 1996: 1-2)

Thus, a manuscript can offer insight into the way these texts were, were intended to have been, or could have been read by the patron or audience with whom it was shared.

1.2 Thesis Rationale

This thesis presents an examination of three poems from the Exeter Book: JDayI, ResA and ResB. Using the approach of manuscript studies it argues that thematic, palaeographical and codicological evidence suggests that the manuscript compiler deliberately placed these texts together to be read for a specific devotional purpose. Consequently, it examines the impact of this paratextual information on the interpretation, division and editing practice of Old English poetry which Genette (1991) terms the ‘fringe’ between a text and its surrounding manuscript information:
This fringe [...] constitutes, between the text and what lies outside it, a zone not just of transition, but of transaction. (Genette 1991: 261)

Section I provides an editorial rationale for a new transcription of JDayI, ResA and ResB, and an analysis of their function as three poems within their manuscript context, with reference to the theory of editing medieval manuscripts. This approach makes reference to emerging issues which surround electronic editing and the rationale of hypertext which, I argue, allow us to reimagine the supposed ‘constraints of the codex’ (McGann 2001: 57) – a common criticism of the print edition.

1.3 Justification of a New Analysis and Transcription of JDayI and ResA and B

Though the poems JDayI, ResA and ResB sit alongside one another in the Exeter Book, they could not have been treated more differently by scholars: JDayI has been largely neglected and is often deemed an inferior Judgement Day poem in comparison with ChrIII and JDayII. Conversely, ResA and ResB have been the subject of much debate with regard to their thematic and codicological unity after the discovery of a missing folio which demonstrated they were in fact two individual texts. Prior to this discovery they were understood as one unified but problematic poem (see: Section II). The discovery of folio loss resulted in an edition of the poems which, for the first time, presented them as individual texts in their own right (see Malmberg 1979). However, though Malmberg’s edition provided ‘a much-needed critical evaluation of these poems’ (Frantzen 1982: 229), his reasons for re-editing and publishing these two poems are not made explicit; Malmberg appears to have no ‘new hard evidence’ (ibid.) about either poem or why they deserved to be re-edited.

In attempting to interpret ResA and ResB anew, critics have been divided in their approach. Modern scholarship does one of two things: divorce the texts from one another and analyse them individually, or dispute the manuscript evidence of a missing folio and continue to interpret them as a single unified text. Though the editor of the most recent anthology of the Exeter Book (Muir 1999; 2000; 2006) edits these texts as individual poems, he does identify an interesting textual

---

8 For full discussion of the editorial history of ResA and ResB, including textual interpretation, please see: Section II: Thematic Evidence.
grouping in the Exeter Book running from *Wife* to *HomFrIII* where each poem centres on themes of exile, confession, penance, and Judgement Day and relate to the Easter season. It has been argued that the three poems could be better understood if read together as a thematic unit, centred on man’s concept of *wyrd* in the face of Judgement Day (Lochrie 1986b: 323-31). My own conclusions, reached independently, are of a similar nature, but specify that a close examination of the manuscript, compilation, *mise-en-page* and divisional practices reveal a manuscript relationship between the three texts which has gone largely unnoticed. Lochrie’s article (1986b) serves to reinforce my argument; however, her article examines only one of a number of links between the texts and fails to offer any solution as to the purpose of such a grouping within the Exeter Book. This thesis aims to answer those specific research questions:

1. Can paratextual and codicological information provide evidence of manuscript compilation?
2. In turn, can this evidence reveal textual groupings between poems within a codex (here, the Exeter Book)?
3. Can this evidence then point to the intended purpose of these groups of texts and perhaps the original intention, purpose and design of the manuscript?

It was decided a fresh transcription and textual analysis was required for these three poems. Sections II-V of this thesis therefore seek to do the following:

- chart the editorial and critical history of the three texts
- examine and analyse their relationship to one another
- offer a new textual interpretation, fostering an increased understanding of what I believe is the function of *JDayI*, uniting opposing readings of *ResA* and *B* in particular
- display better this relationship, manuscript context and manuscript evidence within a diplomatic transcription with facing facsimilie image.

This thesis offers a transcription of *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB* with an extended literary discussion of the poems individually alongside a reconsideration of previous scholarship. Analogues for the poems are examined and previous genre classification reassessed. *ResA* and *ResB* are reinterpreted as two individual poems, following the codicological evidence of Frantzen/Bliss (1979). *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB* are more closely related than has been previously considered and
by contributing to the thematic evidence brought to light by previous scholars (Lochrie 1986b, Anderson 1986, Muir 2000) the relationship between manuscript and text is examined to demonstrate the links between the poems and to suggest their wider function within the manuscript.

1.4 Editorial Theory and Medieval Texts

Textual scholars must labour to elucidate the histories of a work’s production, reproduction, and reception, and all aspects of these labours bear intimately and directly on the ‘critical interpretation of a work’. (McGann 1985: 78, citing Tanselle 1975: 355)

Perhaps the best-known critical editions of medieval texts of the last fifty years are the Riverside Chaucer edition of the *Canterbury Tales* and the *Piers Plowman* B-text by George Kane and E. Talbot Donaldson (1975). In each, multiple witnesses of the text survive, and the editor is faced with the task of choosing which to use (if not all) and how to best present this information. Riverside favours two Chaucerian manuscripts, Hengwrt and Ellesmere, and provides a single version of the *Canterbury Tales* based on a 1957 edition of the *Tales* by Robinson. In his preface to the Riverside edition, Benson states,

> When Ellesmere stands alone, its readings have been considered with somewhat more scepticism than Robinson showed in 1957, and even more scepticism entered the consideration of those cases where Robinson chose a metrically smoother line from later manuscripts against the testimony of both Ellesmere and Hengwrt. But in those cases where it seemed to the editors that the choice between alternate readings was doubtful, Robinson’s decisions were usually accepted. The text of the *Tales* therefore contains no radical departure from Robinson’s 1957 edition, though it has been thoroughly revised. (Benson et al. 1988: xli)

The resulting edition is a critical edition, rather than a multiple-version edition, with textual notes to the base of the page, alternate readings (where deemed appropriate), and a version of the poem is presented based on two manuscript witnesses and the 1957 edition which preceded Riverside.  

---

In contrast, Kane/Donaldson present a somewhat controversial edition of the *Piers Plowman* B-text, stating in the introduction to the edition that,

> The authority of our text is [...] like that of all edited texts, in no sense absolute. It can however be judged from the information we have provided, first in particular terms of how perceptively we have, line by line and reading by reading, identified originality, and second, more generally, by whether in arguing from such identification to the question of revision we have correctly interpreted the detailed relations between the texts if the three versions of the poem. Its user should scrutinise our assumptions, check our affective responses against his own, and examine the logic of our inferences. He will find [...] that our text is of varying authority [...]. (Kane/Donaldson 1975: 212)

What Kane/Donaldson provide is an edition which is user-centric, in that it actively encourages, even requires, interpretation, individual judgement and examination from the perspective of the user of the edition, rather than providing what has previously been termed a definitive edition to be taken on face value as the ultimate authority on a text.

In an article reviewing this 1975 Kane/Donaldson edition, Robert Adams says of editing,

> Textual criticism, properly conceived, is far more central to the entire hermeneutic task of literary scholarship than the role it has usually been assigned in recent decades. In the last sixty years or so [...] practitioners of textual criticism have largely been relegated to tasks both preliminary and ancillary (the mere production of a dependable scholarly text), after which the literary critics have exercised their more glamorous talents – on a text which they have usually accepted on faith (Adams 2006: 131).

Here, Adams quotes Jerome McGann’s 1985 essay which emphasises this cultural split in questioning the relevance of textual and bibliographical studies to literary interpretation. McGann classifies the Kane/Donaldson edition as an ‘experimental critical edition’ and a ‘polemical edition’ (McGann 1985: 83–84) which Adams paraphrases as ‘a noteworthy exception to the unexamined assumptions of most editors, and an example of scholars aware of their own implication of the social matrix of textual creation’ (Adams 2006: 133). In his 2001 work, McGann continues this examination of the *Piers Plowman* edition arguing that the horizon of the ‘definitive critical edition’ has all but been abandoned in favour of the Kane/Donaldson theoretical view that ‘a critical edition is a hypothesis ‘designed to account for a body of
phenomena in the light of our given historical knowledge, [and therefore] must be judged to have gained considerable authority’ (McGann 2001: 77, citing Kane/Donaldson 1975: 212).

A number of issues are important here:

1. The editor of any (medieval) text cannot produce a truly ‘definitive’ edition of a text but only a hypothesised version of that text
2. Studies of stemmata, codicology and palaeography have an important role to play in the shape of the final edition and its subsequent interpretation
3. Every editorial decision is an abstraction of the original text, which in turn is the editor’s duty to make as transparent as possible to the audience.

To transcribe a text is still to edit it, though the value of a diplomatic transcription vs. a critical edition has long been debated. However, by recreating a text in print, whether as a critical edition or a diplomatic transcription, one has actively changed the form of the text. Even our best efforts can no longer retain the manuscript context and palaeographical or codicological evidence visible via the original manuscript page. At first glance, creating a diplomatic transcription of *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB* appears to be a rather straightforward task: all texts are copied by the same hand, they are all found together in the same manuscript and none of the poems survives in any other Old English manuscript. But just as Kane/Donaldson’s edition emphasised the importance of bringing together variant manuscripts in a manner that presents the editorial processes and interpretative implications as clearly as possible to the audience, with the focus very much on the audience’s interpretation of the evidence presented in the edition, so information of the *mise-en-page* alongside codicological and palaeographical evidence within the Exeter Book have here been deemed integral to the textual interpretation of these texts and should therefore be presented as clearly as possible in the resulting transcription. My argument that these three Exeter Book texts display manuscript evidence of compilation practices for a specific devotional function remains an interpretation, though a fully-supported one; just as the editorial practice of divorcing texts from their manuscript context, providing a title and modern punctuation makes what was originally visible in the manuscript now *un*visible in print, so the act of transcribing these three texts as a unit must retain a visibility of the evidence the
manuscript represents. As a result, I present a diplomatic transcription of the texts, alongside facing facsimile images of the manuscript, rather than a critical edition, to help aid this abstraction from manuscript to print, and to emphasise the information visible on the manuscript page which is key to the poems’ interpretation. To this end, a discussion of the editorial practices involved in producing an edition and/or transcription, which argues for the interpretation of the texts as a unit, follows below.

1.5 Conservative vs. Liberal Editing

The most important thing […] is to know at all times exactly what we are doing (Lass 1976: 220).

In the spirit of Lass’s observation, this present discussion attempts to set down in writing an outline of the editorial decisions that direct my transcription; specifically, those that affect the choices made in the presentation of the transcription. As discussed above, transcription is a form of editing, and in turn, editing is a process of interpretation and abstraction; simply by transcribing a text from its manuscript, the editor has ascribed some level of interpretation and ultimately contributed to a change in the text. Any edition produced is not an exact representation of a text as it is found in the manuscript, but a version of that text which has been subjected to a series of editorial decisions and changes, whether this constitutes the expansion of abbreviations or extends to the addition of extra half-lines to remedy apparent metrical deficiencies. It is therefore necessary to explain from the start the decisions that have been taken in producing this transcription, why they have been made, and how the subsequent text differs – where applicable – from what is found in the original manuscript.

The decision to produce a diplomatic or a critical edition is one much debated in recent scholarship. On the one hand, conservative editors present a clean, de-problematised text in a uniform format. On the other hand, as Lapidge explains, liberal (critical) editors assume that the original author of a text is ‘unlikely to have produced nonsense and that any such nonsense in the transmitted text is therefore the result of scribal corruption’; he concludes that the editor’s duty is

---

10 I follow the terminology suggested by Lapidge (1993: 131-57).
to identify and eliminate scribal corruption in order to present the text in a form more nearly resembling what the editor deems the author to have originally written, rather than what happens to be transmitted by the scribe (Lapidge 1993: 132). Both approaches have their followers and their place in textual criticism; however, as Frantzen states,

My preference [is for a] belief in the value of manuscripts as testimony to lived language experience. We can be sure that the text [in these] manuscript[s] is the written and spoken language of a speaker of some form of Old English; we cannot make the same claim about the text of Lapidge’s reconstruction. (Franzten 1993: 171)

A conservative edition (also known as a diplomatic edition) reproduces what is transmitted to us via the manuscript as closely as possible, allowing the edition’s audience the opportunity to draw their own conclusions as to an interpretation of the manuscript. As Stanley argues,

We in our subject have to remember with constant humility that though […] most scribes may not have been the equals in Old English of the best Old English poets, every one of them, sleepy and careless as he may have been at times, knew his living Old English better than the best modern editor of Old English verse (1984: 257).

In this respect, those who follow conservative editorial techniques believe it is better to reproduce the text as closely as possible as it stands in the manuscript (Gneuss 1973: 15). This endeavour has received renewed support with the recent developments of electronic editing and the wave of digital editions of medieval manuscripts, which allow the audience to view the visual evidence (of script, layout, corresponding manuscript art etc.) alongside any edited text in a manner previously unimaginable in print. The digital editions of Beo, for example, convey the editorial processes to the reader in order that they might engage in interpretative practice of their own, where fire damaged parchment photographed under UV light displays previously lost fragments of text, for example. Other digital projects such as McGann’s Rossetti archive aim to make the resource user-centric, so that the user decides in which way they interact with the resource. Both these examples place the audience at the centre of the resource, in a very similar way to Kane/Donaldson over thirty years previous. At the centre of each electronic edition is the image: be it manuscript page, illumination, or increased interactivity with the text itself via mouse-overs and parallel-view screens which in turn direct the focus of editing more firmly towards the manuscript evidence than has previously been available. This method of prioritising
image over edited text can in turn help reimagine the print edition. The availability of digital images of medieval manuscripts, in this instance the Exeter Book, makes this a viable option, where manuscript evidence can be prioritised. Images of the Exeter Book reproduced throughout this thesis allow for a transcription where manuscript image and diplomatic transcription appear side-by-side (as a parallel-view screen in a digital edition would do), thus making the editorial procedures involved in this transcription fully transparent and placing an emphasis on the importance of manuscript context and paratext visible in the manuscript.

Conversely, a liberal edition allows the audience to see (what the editor deems to be) a text that is the closest to the original version of a work, free of scribal error and, as Kemble states, ‘much more like the [author’s] original than the MS’ (Kemble 1833, cited in Lapidge 1993: 134). Many scholars believe that this should be – indeed, believe it is – the primary responsibility of any editor of a medieval text: ‘[a]n editor’s principal duty is not that of assuaging the tempers of conservative editors, but of establishing as far as is humanly possible what the author actually wrote’ (Lapidge 1993: 149). Frantzen concedes, ‘editorial emendation is […] a necessary rewriting’ (1991: 183). This necessary rewriting depends of course on the very nature of the text being edited. Where a text has more than one witness, or can even be linked to a surviving manuscript from which it was originally copied, an editor might more easily determine from the differences between the manuscripts, from the scribal errors in the copy text along with their knowledge of the language, what the author’s original may well have been. However, where a text survives in only one manuscript, how can editors find conclusive evidence which will enable them to produce an edition they can confidently claim is as near as good enough to the author’s original text, before these ‘sleepy and careless’ scribes (Stanley 1984: 257) interfered by adding their own mistakes and emendations? As Doane (1998: 45) asks, why should this (liberal editing) be the only model or method of editing texts? He continues that the purpose of editing any text is not to transmit it as it was first written (which he deems an impossibility), but to make it more available than it was in previous forms. The method chosen to edit a medieval text is therefore a matter of personal preference, or is determined by the series in which the edition is printed (e.g. ASPR), or depends on the needs or abilities of the intended readership. Ultimately, it would appear the two extremes of each editorial approach cannot easily be reconciled. ‘Any edition that

is ‘critical’, i.e. based on hypotheses, comparison of sources, or ‘thinking’ […] is first and foremost an ‘editorial’ edition – that is, it is a construct by the editor’ (Doane 1998: 47).

1.6 Considering Manuscript Context

In an attempt to produce a version of Old English verse that reflects neither of the extremes of conservative or liberal editorial technique – but rather exists somewhere between the two – the importance of manuscript context comes into play. In his argument for a new ASPR, Scragg outlines the need for Old English scholars ‘to be constantly reminded of the form in which the poetry was recorded for Anglo-Saxon readers’ (1998: 68). Similar pleas for the importance of considering manuscript context are made, to name a few, in Doane (1994: 125–45 and 1998: 45-65), O’Brien O’Keeffe (1994: 147-54), Keefer (1998: 21-44) and Caie (1994: 155-62). Keefer states: ‘the way in which we understand Old English verse ‘text’ when it is written down should inherently be governed by the manuscript versions in which it appears’ (1998: 21). The importance of manuscript context, for example in explaining the disjunction between ResA and ResB (detailed in Section II pp. 15ff) emphasises the need to show manuscript information in printed editions. In acknowledging that a manuscript folio is missing between two consecutive texts and then subconsciously neglecting, or actively choosing not to show this division in an edited version of the texts, the editor misrepresents the relationship between the texts. Malmberg’s edition of what he entitles simply Resignation (1979) does just this. Though he edits ResA and ResB as separate poems, his edition refers to both texts under only one title and his edition fails to display the texts in such a way that the impact of the missing folio at l. 70 of ResA is made explicit. By editing the poems in this way, the reader’s interpretation of how these texts are presented in their manuscript form is skewed. ‘Separation of the verse into individual poems and divorce of those poems from surrounding material are subjects which have been debated recently, and editors would have to consider them further in respect of all of their pieces’ (Scragg 1998: 69).

As Caie states, ‘editors [of Old English] ought to feel a responsibility to convey the context, both codicological and socio-historical, of the work they edit’ (1994: 155). A similar plea is found in Robinson (1989: 193) where he points out that many Old English texts have no clear divisions,
most have no titles, and many texts originally conceived to be separate works can in fact be read as either one and the same poem or as conceptual units linked by theme, designed for a specific purpose. In his chapter, Robinson (1989: 193-200) demonstrates that *Exhort* and *Summons* (CCCC 201), previously considered individual works, are in fact one text. As Section III will argue, this textual group shares a similarity of compilation and intended function to *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB* in the Exeter Book. Caie (1994: 155-162) takes the argument for CCCC 201 compilation further and demonstrates that in fact what were originally five separate works (four, now that the above two are considered together) function as a group in the manuscript, and that the compiler may well have had good reason for placing them together in this way. The additional importance of this, in respect to *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB*, is that this group of poems in CCCC 201 is also headed by a poem relating to Judgement Day: *JDayII*.12 With such evidence for the importance of making visible in print what is visible in the manuscript, as far as the constraints of print will allow, this thesis offers a diplomatic transcription of *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB* rather than a critical edition. It is believed that diplomatic transcriptions do indeed have an important role to play within textual scholarship, here to make transparent the abstraction of a text from manuscript to print, involved when creating any transcription of a text. This ‘middle ground’, if one can name it this, between manuscript and critical edition, is key to an understanding the nature of the editing process and the significance of manuscript evidence to textual interpretation. By providing a transcription of these poems, I argue that highlighting such evidence, so often overlooked in print, should guide our interpretation of Old English texts more than the reconstructed text of the critical edition.

In order to argue that *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB* function as a unit in the Exeter Book, it is first necessary to examine each poem individually. As detailed previously in this section, the editorial and critical histories of *ResA* and *ResB* are a complex one and must be understood in full before new interpretations are offered. Similarly, *JDayI* has been somewhat neglected by scholars and heavily criticised in the little scholarship which does exist. A review of previous literature and a fresh analysis of theme, structure and genre of each poem are therefore offered in the following section, Section II, to provide a foundation of thematic evidence which will be used to support

---

12 For further discussion of CCCC201 and its relationship with the Exeter Book poems of this edition, see Section II.
the contention of this thesis: that these three texts were compiled as a unit with a specific purpose. This contention ultimately informs the shape of the transcription (Section V), where manuscript context is conveyed through layout of a diplomatic transcription with facing facsimile images.
Section II

Thematic Evidence

The argument put forward in this thesis is twofold: first that the poems benefit from being read together as a conceptual or thematic unit and second, codicological and palaeographical evidence supports this hypothesis.

In order to understand how the three poems function as a unit, Section II details how they function as individual texts, and how they have been interpreted and received critically in previous scholarship. I do not argue that these texts were composed together, or were even by the same poet, but rather that their compilation and layout in the Exeter Book is of significance in understanding the intended function of the texts within the manuscript. What follows, therefore, is a literary analysis and critical history of each text individually. This leads into Section III which provides analysis of the texts as a unit, providing an investigation of the contextual evidence suggestive of the purpose and function of this textual grouping which is also reflected in other types of text and manuscripts. Section IV offers an examination of the manuscript evidence which supports this reading. Each section (II to IV) in turn informs the shape of the transcription of Section V.

2.1 JDayI: A Critical History

JDayI is a largely neglected poem; rarely the subject of scholarly investigation, it is only occasionally translated or anthologised.\(^{13}\) Karma Lochrie reports in her 1981 PhD dissertation on judgment and spiritual Apocalypse in Old English eschatological poetry that she was unable to find a single article-length publication devoted to the study of the poem (1981: 78),\(^{14}\) the only

---

\(^{13}\) See: Mackie (1934); Krapp/Dobbie (1936); Kennedy (1943); Anderson (1962); Bolton (1963), Whitbread (1967); Wrenn (1967); Shippey (1976); Caie (1976); Bradley (1982); Muir (1994; 2000); Boenig (2000).

\(^{14}\) Lochrie’s PhD dissertation uses the following texts to analyse the eschatological tradition in Old English poetry and prose: ChrIII, JDayII and JDayI where she concludes the texts each focus on a different kind of spiritual Apocalypse: JDayI, on the Apocalypse of man’s understanding, JDayII, on the Apocalypse of his self-knowledge, and ChrIII, on the Apocalypse of his vision. See below for further discussion of Lochrie’s work in relation to JDayI.
subsequent publication to focus solely on JDayI to date is an article by Lochrie herself (1986a) and the only other studies which include any extended detail on the poem are a chapter within a larger study of the Judgement Day theme in Anglo-Saxon poetry (Caie, 1976), and another within a study of wisdom literature (Shippey, 1976). Where the poem is discussed (e.g. in Old English anthologies), Wrenn (1967: 158) finds that it lacks dramatic narrative vigour; Anderson (1962: 176) deems it a conventional treatment of the Judgement Day theme and that it is less detailed, more general and therefore less distinguished than the other Judgement Day poems (ChrIII and JDayII); Bradley (1982: 386) classifies it as yet another homiletic, hortatory poem; Muir considers it a conventional treatment of ‘one of the most ubiquitous topics in medieval literature’ (1994: 668); while Kennedy writes,

The Doomsday of the Exeter Book need not detain us. It deals briefly with material which in Christ III is expanded into a long poem, and the shaping spirit is homiletic rather than epic or dramatic. The Exeter Doomsday lacks the imaginative energy which gives brilliance to the Doomsday lines of the Christ. The Corpus Christi Doomsday is a much finer poem. (1943: 326)

Where the poem has been afforded more consideration, it is still considered unsatisfactory: Caie (1976: 95) in his chapter-length study of the text states that it is ‘not a great poem, nor one of outstanding literary craftsmanship’. However, he does state the poem deserves greater attention,

and this thesis. Other dissertations to refer in any detail to JDayI include: Deering (1890); Daniels (1966); Keenan (1968); Caie (1974); Michaels (1980); Perry (1984); Hasenfratz (1988); Church (1993); Renick (1994).

These publications display the two methods by which the poem has previously been analysed: as a Judgement Day poem and as part of the genre of wisdom literature. Detailed discussion of each follows in this section.

Bradley fails to include a translation of the poem in his anthology (1982); he describes it as follows:

119 verse lines. Another homiletic, hortatory poem in which a first-person speaker appeals directly to the audience, here on the matter of Doomsday. With the unpinning of the waters divided by God at the Creation, briefly released in judgment upon mankind in Noah’s Flood, and serving similarly to set God’s chosen people apart from their enemies in the crossing of the Red Sea (which itself prefigures the sacrament of Baptism), the Day of Judgment will begin; but the poem is less concerned with epic narrative (compare ChrIII) than with impressionistic anticipation of how individual souls will perceive their condition on that day, according to the burden of guilt they are accruing here and now in this world. It is a major contribution to the penitential content of the codex. See the headnotes to JgDII. (1982: 386)

However, the headnotes of JDayII referring to JDayI state: ‘The poem (JDayII), […] bears little specific relation beyond theme to JDayI in the Exeter Book […]’. The translation is neglected despite Bradley’s statement the poem is a ‘major contribution ’ to the penitential content of the Exeter Book and even though he continues to translate shorter poems as Almsgiving, thus affording them more attention. It is of interest that the other Exeter Book texts Bradley does not translate are: Cans, Prec, Vain, OrW, Rim, Part, Phar, LPrI, HomFrII, Rid30b, and a number of other Riddles. These texts are either extremely short, deficient (text is missing, as with Part), or repetitious (as with Rid30b). The omission of a JDayI translation and a note to refer to JDayII therefore indicates Bradley deemed JDayII a more successful Doomsday poem and contributes to what Lochrie refers to as the ‘widespread neglect’ of the poem (1982:80).
especially as a text that can indicate how Anglo-Saxon poets interpreted and used traditional eschatological material.

Assigned by Krapp/Dobbie (1936) to distinguish it from their ASPR edition of *JDayII*, the poem’s title has done little to help *JDayI* in the face of such criticism. The title promotes a textual misinterpretation: in consequence the poem is compared with the Judgement Day poems *JDayII* and *ChrIII* (the former especially) and subsequently considered the least successful member of that genre. As Fischer notes,

> While titles are names, they are a good deal more than just names [...] The unique purpose of titling is hermeneutical, [as] titles are names which function as guides to interpretation [...] to allow for interpretative discourse [...] If the title does not allow for interpretative discourse, it is nothing more than a label. (1984: 288)

In particular, the poet of *JDayI* has been criticised for appearing only to refer to the Doomsday flood and fire, ignoring the remaining thirteen signs of the Apocalypse, and apparently confusing the fires of hell and the fires of the Last Judgement throughout; in fact, less than half the poem’s contents deal with the events of Doomsday. The poem’s subsequent critical reception has deemed *JDayI* simply as a ‘didactic’ text. However, this term does not aid interpretation of the poem and is not fully descriptive of the poem’s content or the poet’s aim; the same ‘didactic’ label could be applied to most Old English poetry. As Lochrie observes, the complaint of the poem’s didacticism that extends throughout most of the critical comments is more damaging than the widespread neglect of the poem itself (1981: 80).

---

*JDayII* is a later Old English eschatological poem, based on Bede’s *Dei Iudicii* and found in CCCC MS 201; more detailed discussion of this manuscript and its relation to *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB* can be found below. This has also previously been known as the *Corpus Christi Doomsday*, referenced by Kennedy, above (1943: 326). *JDayI* was previously known as the *Exeter Doomsday*. 

---

17 *JDayII* is a later Old English eschatological poem, based on Bede’s *Dei Iudicii* and found in CCCC MS 201; more detailed discussion of this manuscript and its relation to *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB* can be found below. This has also previously been known as the *Corpus Christi Doomsday*, referenced by Kennedy, above (1943: 326). *JDayI* was previously known as the *Exeter Doomsday*. 

---
2.2 *JDayI*: Themes and Structure

To aid further discussion of the content and function of *JDayI*, a resume of the poem’s contents is below; discussion of the structure of the poem follows. Where *JDayI* has been considered in any detail, the poem’s abstract structure has been criticised: the poet does not use the events of Doomsday to structure the text (as with *ChriII* and *JDayII*), nor does he place the poem within a wider narrative, such as that of the dreamer of *JDayII*. Rather, the poem opens in the midst of the action, stating the poet’s belief that Judgement Day will happen to every man, before detailing the fire of the Apocalypse and the fate that awaits the sinful:

\[
\text{δᾶτ gelimpan sceal: þætte lagu floweð} \\
\text{flod ofer foldan; feores bið æt ende} \\
\text{anra gehwylcum.}
\]

*It shall happen: that a flood of water will flow over the earth; life, for every man, will be at an end.* (JDayI ll.1-3a)

In many respects, one can understand the previous criticism of the poem’s structure; the poet opens his text with the general horror of Doomsday and yet does not outline his aim until line 46b:

\[
\text{Forþon, ic a wille} \\
\text{leode læran þæt hi lof godes} \\
\text{hergan on heahþu, hyhtum to wuldre} \\
\text{lifgen on geleafan, ond a lufan dryhtnes} \\
\text{wyrcaen in þisse worulde, ær þon se wlonca dæg} \\
\text{bodige þurh byman brynehatne leg,} \\
\text{egsan oferþrym.}
\]

*Therefore, I wish to teach people that they should praise God’s glory on high, live in faith with the hope of glory, and always love the Lord’s deeds in this world before that day of splendour announces with trumpets the burning heat of fire, the overpowering terror.* (JDayI ll. 46b-52a)
Previous classification of *JDayI* as one of the few Anglo-Saxon poems whose topic is devoted solely to the theme or subject of Judgment Day is therefore understandable. However, if one understands the poem as functioning as an abstract text in three sections, the true function of the text is revealed. Rather than a poem which confuses the fires of hell and the fires of the Last Judgement, or which fails to adhere to the signs of Doomsday, the poem is in fact designed for an entirely different function: to focus the mind of the audience on the certainty of Judgement Day and on the fate of their own souls on that day.

To this end, each of the three sections can be identified by the introduction and exemplification of a specific type of man, the hostile-thinking (*gromhydig*, l. 14a) man, the little-thinking man who feasts to abandon, and the deep-thinking man who meditates now upon the state of his soul. A tripartite division allows one to see more clearly the recurring images used by the poet to frame and direct his text. Two main images are used in each section: 1) fire, be it the fire of Judgement or the fire of hell, and 2) the depiction of three types of man – the hostile-thinking men who now rule earth and actively seek hell through their misdeeds; man wanton with feasting, or the little-thinking man (*lyt [...] gepenceð*, l. 77b) too preoccupied with enjoying the pleasures of the earth to think on his fate at Judgement Day; and finally the deep-thinking man, who is contrite and suffers great anxiety in his mind as he ponders his fate. Additionally, the poet offers three variants of the statement ‘it shall happen’: *Đæt gelimpan sceal* (l. 1a); *Hwæþre þæt gegongeð* (l. 98a); *ac hit þus gelimpan sceal* (l. 116a). In using this statement in his opening and closing phrases in particular, the poet frames his poem by emphasising that Judgement Day cannot be avoided, it will happen to everyone, living and deceased, good and evil. In so doing the poet reinforces his ultimate aim: *Forþon ic a wille | leode læran þæt hi lof Godes | hergan on heahþu*: ‘Therefore I wish to teach people that they should praise God’s glory on high’ (ll. 46b-48a) before Judgement Day occurs. As his closing line states, prosperity in glory will be given to man who now thinks well (*welan ah in wuldre se nu wel þenceð*, l. 119).

---

18 Elsewhere, the theme can be seen in scattered references and shorter descriptions within other Old English poems. Shorter descriptions can be found in *Exo, El, Phoen, Jul, Sat, Dream, SoulI* and *SoulII* while references to the topic can be seen in *GenA* and *GenB, Exo, And, Jul, MSol.*
In her article exploring the structure and wisdom of *JDayI*, Lochrie notes the use of the three depictions of man as a structural tool employed by the poet that subsequently forms the centre of the poem (1986a: 201-10).\(^{19}\) The images of the three types of men work together to form an abstract triptych, around which the poet hinges the focus on man’s knowledge in the present and his wisdom surrounding his final Judgement. As Lochrie points out, these two themes are not immediately connected in the poem (1986a: 203); rather, the poet allows them to develop and interlink as he describes these individual types and their differing knowledge of, and approach to, their ultimate destiny. The *gromhydig* (hostile-thinking, l. 14a) man is the first the poet describes to us, appearing fourteen lines into the poem. Men of this kind have taken control of the earth and are, like those who first fell with Lucifer to hell from heaven,\(^{20}\) full of pride, while also focused on material wealth on earth (*gylpe strynað*, l. 14b) rather than spiritual wealth in this world and the next. This man seeks hell and rejects God not only through his actions but also through his lack of knowledge or meditation; the poet uses the image of this man as one who never thinks the truth within his own heart, describing his lack of knowledge of the dark side of creation, and how it stands eternally ready to accept his soul once it has been cast down to hell at Judgement Day:

```plaintext
Ne con he þa mircan gesceaf,
    hu hi butan ende  ece stondeð
þam þe þær for his synnum  onsægd weorþeð,
onde þonne a to ealdre  orleg dreogeð.
```

*[Neither has he knowledge of that dark (side of) creation, how, without end, it stands eternally for him there because of his sins, cast down and then suffer his fate forever.]*

*(JDayI ll. 26b-29)*

In other words, this type of man cannot fathom the grim reality of his fate because he is utterly mired in the present; his wisdom does not extend to knowledge of the state of his own soul or how his deeds will damn him at Judgement Day. Further, the *gromhydig* man not only sullies his soul with his own sins, but destroys the peace of others through calumny (*tomældeð*, l. 26a). The poet emphasises that it is due to this particular sin, over all other misdeeds, that this type of man

---

\(^{19}\) It should be noted that these initial conclusions were drawn independently of Lochrie’s 1986a article and were first presented in this form at Leeds IMC 2008 and subsequently at LOMERS Exeter Book Conference in 2009. Lochrie’s article serves to confirm this tripartite reading of *JDayI*; however, her article does not take the reading further. A discussion of the structure of *JDayI*, including references to the use of ‘heat’ and ‘flame’ as a structural technique are original to this thesis.

\(^{20}\) See Isaiah 14: 11-12.
shall suffer a miserable journey to the abyss of hell (\textit{þæt is helle grund sarlic siðfæt þa þe sibbe ful oft tomeldeð mid his muþe}: ‘a miserable journey to the abyss of hellfire to those who frequently destroy peace by spreading tales with his mouth’ ll. 24b–26a). In this way, the poet calls upon Proverbs 6: 14-19 where the ‘sowers of discord’, those who destroy peace with their mouths, are described as one of the six things hated by God.\footnote{See also: Prov. 11:19; 12:13; 16:272-8; and 18:6-7. Though the poet does not use one specific biblical source for the poem, he illustrates his text with biblical references throughout; this serves to give the poem a homiletic tone.}

The poet then juxtaposes the image of the \textit{gromhydig} man with the little-thinking man, who also does not possess the capacity for knowledge of the next world as he is too concerned with his life on earth. Worse than the \textit{gromhydig} man, this man boasts that despite his many sins and his preoccupation with earthly pleasures, he shall still be offered a place in heaven:

\begin{verbatim}
no þæs gilpan þearf
synfull sawel, þæt hyre sie swegl ongean,
þonne he gehyrwede fol oft lage lare,
brigdeð onbysmer.
[The sinful soul need not boast that heaven awaits him, when he, bringer of blasphemy, often speaks in contempt.] (JDayI ll. 68b-71a)
\end{verbatim}

This man is blasphemous (\textit{onbysmer}, l. 71a) but believes he will be redeemed at the Last Judgement. Unlike the \textit{gromhydig} man, the little-thinking man is boastful of the redemption he is convinced he shall receive; here he does think on his Judgement, but falsely believes in his salvation without performing any good deeds or carrying out any form of contrition or repentance to secure the salvation he believes he is to enjoy. In this way, this man is portrayed as worse than the first, as he has the foresight to think upon his Judgement but not the foresight to understand his own fate; he too is entirely preoccupied with the present:

\begin{verbatim}
lyt þæt geþenceð,
se þe him wines glæd wilna bruceð,
siteð him symbelgal sip ne bemurneð,
hu him æfter þisse worulde weordan mote.
\end{verbatim}
[He thinks little, free of sin, cheerful over his wine, enjoying his (earthly) pleasures, sits feasting excessively, not worrying of his journey, how things will come to be for him after this world.] (JDayI ll. 77b-80b).

Just as the gromhydig man does not have any knowledge of the dark creation (mircan gesceaf 1.26b) which awaits his damned soul, so the little-thinking man cannot comprehend the terrors that await him in hell before he experiences it at Judgement Day: ne con he þæs brogan dæl | yfles ondgiet ær hit hine on fealled (ll. 72b-73). For both these men, Judgement will bring knowledge with a vengeance; the gromhydig man has had his knowledge limited by his wrathful character while the little-thinking man, sated with feasting, has had his knowledge limited by sloth, ‘sated with pleasure and wine, so it gives no thought to the truth, death or Judgement’ (Lochrie, 1986a: 204).

Our final figure embodies a soul who is set for redemption: this is our deophydig (deep-thinking) man, introduced at l. 81. This man does not provide the image of a wholly perfect man: he is very much human and admits to committing sins, but unlike his counterparts he thinks sorrowfully upon his misdeeds and suffers much anxiety as he contemplates his fate at the Last Judgement. However, the description of this man is accompanied throughout by the important message that God will repay this man’s good deeds and his penance at Judgement Day:

Wile þonne forgieldan  gæsta dryhten
willum æfter þære wyrde,  wuldres ealdor,
þam þe his synna nu  sare geþenceþ,
modbysgunge  micle dreogeð

[Then the Lord of Souls, Prince of Glory, will repay as is his fate, he who suffers great anxiety in his mind, reflects seriously upon his sins.] (JDayI ll. 81-84)

This sentiment is then repeated in the following lines, reinforcing the message that thinking now upon the state of one’s soul, no matter what misdeeds have been performed before, is what will open up the possibility of redemption at Doomsday:

him þæt þonne geleanað  lifes waldend,
heofona hyrde,  æfter heonansife
godum dædum,  þæs þe he swa gemor wearð,
sarig fore his synnum.
However, in order to secure one’s salvation, one must not be negligent in following these teachings if one is to enjoy the dwelling place God has prepared for those who think well on the state of their souls before Judgement. Unlike the other two men, the deophydig man obeys God to attain his salvation. In viewing his fate from the standpoint of the future, rather than the present here on earth, this man is able to consider the truth in his own heart before it becomes public knowledge at the Last Judgement.

In this way, the poet develops the theme of man’s knowledge in the present, and his ultimate knowledge of his fate at Judgement Day throughout the course of his poem and via the use of three separate depictions of the state of man. The audience is taken through the varying states of sinful unknowing (type one) to a form of knowledge that has temporal limitations in which man receives no greater wisdom of his own fate (type two). In presenting these types of men first in the poem, the poet allows the audience to develop their understanding of what it is to have full knowledge of one’s fate: this leads to the presentation of this final depiction (type three). In each separate case, the state of man’s thinking directly affects his final Judgement. The man who does not meditate at all is fated for the fires of hell; he who thinks of Judgement Day, but limits his meditation to only of the ends of this world, and not for the implications on the next, is also to be damned. The poet’s aim is to emphasise that it is the soul that thinks on the truth of his destiny in his own heart, and thinks on it well, that shall be saved. As Lochrie succinctly states, ‘thinking well […] is the poet’s main concern [and ultimately] the criterion by which man will be judged’ (1986a: 204).

2.2.1 JDayI: Typological Framing Techniques

Reading the poem in three sections, each focused around a depiction of the state of man’s ability to know his fate, permits understanding of the poet’s main concern. However, as mentioned above, a main criticism of the poem is that the poet appears to confuse the fires of hell and those of the Last Judgement and refers only to the fire and flood of Doomsday rather than recounting the full list of apocalyptic signs. Just as the poet’s use of the three types of man functions as a
thematic triptych, so the continued references to fire, both hell fire and Judgement fire, can be
seen as a typological framing technique; both work together to underpin the poet’s central thesis.
The first four lines of the poem therefore offer an introduction and the last four a conclusion as a
frame for the poet’s argument, taking the reader from God’s divine plan:

Hafað him gehinged hider þeoden user
on þam mæstan dæge, mægencyninga hyhst,
wile þonne forbærnan brego moncynnes
lond mid lige.

[Our Lord, highest King of Power, has determined (the time) to come here, on that greatest day. The Ruler of Mankind will then burn the land completely with fire.] (JDayI ll. 5-8b)

to fire on earth and in hell:

Hat bið onæled,
siþan fyr nimeð foldan sceatas,
byrnende lig beorhte gesceafte

[Heat will be kindled, burning flame, once fire seizes the corners of the world, the bright creation.] (JDayI ll. 9b-11)

before arriving at Judgement once fire has given way:

Siþan æfter þam lige lif bið gestaþelad,
welan ah in wuldre se nu wel þenceð.

[Then after that flame life is established; happiness in glory will be given to him who now meditates well.] (JDayI ll. 118-19)

Within the one hundred and nineteen lines of edited text, the poet refers to fire on ten separate
occasions, thirteen if we also include references to heat. Within these references, no fewer than
eight terms are employed by the poet: three centre on the verb biernan ‘burn’ including the
intensified verb forbærnan ‘burn up completely’ and the adjective brynehāt ‘burning hot’; four
terms denoting ‘fire’: līeg ‘flame’, fyr ‘fire’, glēda ‘flame/ember’, and brand ‘firebrand’; and
finally three separate references to *hāt* ‘heat’. Each of the three sections of the poem, outlined above, contain references to fire, heat or both. In fact, more references are made to fire by the poet than to any of the events of Doomsday, of which we can identify the fire of Doomsday itself as one, alongside the apocalyptic flood, the gathering of people (*folc bīp gebonnen adames bearn ealle to spræce*, ll. 100b-101) and the division of the souls to the left and right hand of God (*he ād on ðæt wynstre weorud wyrs gesceaden þonne he on þa swiþran hond swican mote*, ll. 75-76). In light of this, the poem is not concerned with the events or signs of Doomsday as the traditional genre classification has us expect; rather it uses the recurring image of fire to work alongside its structural triptych of mankind within an abstract structure of linked notional events, all which serve to frame the poem’s main theme: man must meditate deeply upon his soul.

The use of fire or heat is particularly interesting as the poem opens not with a reference to fire, but to the flood at Doomsday which will bring all life to an end. At first glance the image of an apocalyptic flood covering the earth seems out of place; the poet, though he does not purposely refer to the signs of the Apocalypse, would have undoubtedly been aware of the biblical and patristic signs which herald the end of the world. His use of an apocalyptic flood, which the poet refers to twice during the course of his text (ll. 1b, 38b), has no biblical source; the flood of Genesis, sent by God, ultimately brought about God’s covenant to man never to punish him in such a way again (Gen 9: 11). However, as Caie points out (1976: 99), the force and terror of the apocalyptic fire are often compared with the flood (2 Peter 3: 6) and in Matt 24: 37ff Christ compares the Parousia (the second coming of Christ) with the flood in that the time of both

---

22 Hill (1968) argues that heat and cold imagery in Anglo-Saxon poetry relate to the patristic use of both to refer to the ‘heat of charity’ and the ‘cold of sin’: ‘in Anglo-Saxon and other medieval literatures there [...] occurs [...] a pattern of imagery in which heat and cold can also express moral significance – the fiery hot love of perfect charity, and the icy cold of unrepentant sinfulness’ (1968: 523). His argument, drawing from: Matt 24: 12: ‘And because iniquity hath abounded, the charity of many shall grown cold’; Ecclesiasticus 3: 17: ‘[...] and they sins shall melt away as the ice in the fair warm weather’; and Jeremiah 6: 7: ‘As a cistern maketh its water cold, so hath she made her wickedness cold’ puts forth that in *JDayI* ll. 103-7, hell is ‘cold and fixed in winter because the warmth of charity is wholly absent there [...] Since the phrase *hates ond ceales* (l. 106b) is juxtaposed with *godes oþþe yfles* (l. 107a) and hardly meaningful in any other terms, the phrase is clearly an allusion to this figure.’ (1968: 531) The image of good and evil beside hot and cold links to *SolI* (l. 353-358) where Solomon states that good and evil are opposed to one another and can never be reconciled, where, as Hill explains, the statement is phrased in terms of the patristic concept of the heat and fire of charity and the cold and snow of sin. In *JDayI* at ll. 103-7, I would agree that heat and cold are held up as opposites to the natural order, representing the saved and the damned respectively, and relating to charity and sinfulness of man before Judgement Day. All other references to fire and heat refer to the fires of hell or the fires of Judgement, and, as explained below, serve a purgative function alongside the Doomsday flood, to divide and cleanse the good from bad.
events was hidden from man (Matthew 24: 36; cf. Mark 13: 32). Further, both fire and water have a purgative quality; just as the waters of baptism cleanse the soul, so the fires of Judgement divide the sinful from the pure. In other words, the flood invokes the image of a baptism by water which signals the start of Christian life on earth while the fires of Judgement are in fact another type of baptism – a baptism by fire, signalling the end of man’s life on earth and the start of his life in the next world. The sacrament of baptism imitates the baptism of fire at the Last Judgement, in which man is spared the latter by performing the former on earth. Just as the flood at the time of Noah covered the earth, so the fire of Judgement will do the same at Doomsday (Matthew 24: 1-40). Immediately after the image of the flood in 1. 1, the poet provides his audience with an exhortation to meditate well upon truth, thus linking the image and exhortation through the message that man must cleanse his own soul in order to attain salvation.

Rather than confusing the fires of hell and Judgement, therefore, the poet consciously uses the theme of fire in general to fortify the image of Judgement fire, even when he is referring to hell fire. Ultimately, this serves to further emphasise his message that Judgement Day will bring about a cleansing of the soul of his sins for each and every man which he argues can only be brought about by thinking well. In each depiction of man the poet presents to us, we have reference to knowledge and meditation, and each characterization is either prefaced or further detailed by reference to fire (be it hell fire or Judgement Day fire). These three thematic devices serve as the poem’s abstract structure where each work both jointly and severally to highlight the central theme of the poem – meditating deeply. The poet exhorts his audience to think well upon their own Judgement, details the various Judgements of those men who do not, and finally shows how salvation can be achieved by following the advice laid out in his poem.

23 Matt 24: 36 ‘But of that day and hour no one knoweth, not the angels of heaven, but the Father alone’; Mark 13: 32 ‘But of that day or hour no man knoweth, neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father’. For further discussion of the site of Judgement Day in medieval traditions, see Hall (1994: 79-97).
24 For further discussion of the symbolism of the sacrament of Baptism at the Apocalypse see Daniélu (1960: 95).
As aforementioned, whereas *JDayII* and *ChristIII* include detailed description of such components as:

- the events, time, place, and the belief of Judgement
- the second coming of Christ (the Parousia)
- the summons to Judgement
- the resurrection of the dead
- the destruction of the world.

As shown above, *JDayI* alludes to these components only briefly if at all. Where these brief references are made in the poem, they are comparable to the shorter references and Doomsday descriptions found throughout Old English poetry more generally, rather than to descriptions in poems whose central theme is Judgement Day. Their presence in the poem acts as an aid or a backdrop to the poet’s central aim, but the references to Doomsday are not the focus for the poet. For example, where *ChrIII* and *JDayII* refer to the belief in the coming Judgement in detail, *JDayI* is much more general and succinct:

*ChristIII:*

\[
\text{Đonne mid fere foldbuende} \\
\text{se micla dæg meahtan dryhtnes} \\
\text{ær midre niht mægne bilmæmeð} \\
\text{scire gesceafte, swa oft sceaða fæcne,} \\
\text{þeof þristlice, þe on þystre fareð,} \\
\text{on sweartræ niht, sorgleæse hæleð} \\
\text{semninga forfæhð sleæpe gebundne,} \\
\text{eorlas ungearwe yfles genægeð.}
\]

*[Then with sudden swiftness upon the midnight, round about earth’s inhabitants and this shining universe will mightily blare the great day of the puissant Lord; just as an insidious vandal, an audacious thief who goes abroad in the dark, in the black night, will often suddenly take careless, sleep-bound men by surprise, it will painfully cast down those people unprepared.]* (ll. 1-8b)

*JDayII:*

\[
\text{Þa ic færinga, forht and unrot,} \\
\text{þas unhyrlican fers onhefde mid sange,} \\
\text{eall swylce þu cwæde, synna gemunde,} \\
\text{life’s leahtra, and þa lan tid,} \\
\text{þæs dimman cyme deaðes on eordan.}
\]

---

25 It should also be noted that *JDayII* and *ChrIII* outweight *JDayI* in terms of length of text: *JDayII* is 306 lines and *ChrIII* 798 lines compared with 119 lines of *JDayI*.

26 For a detailed study of these components and their frequency in Anglo-Saxon poetry, see: Deering (1890).

27 Translation from Bradley (1982).
Ic ondræde me eac     dom þone miclan
for mandædum     minum on eorðan,
and þæt ece ic ece     yrre ondræde me
and synfulra gehwam     æt sylfum gode,
and hu mihtig frea     eall manna cynn
todæleð and todemeð     þurh his dihlan miht.

[Then I suddenly, fearful and sad, began to sing this gloomy verse, mindful of
sins, all such as you may speak of, of the faults of life, and the long tide of the
coming of dark on earth. I feared for myself at that great Judgement, for my sinful
deeds upon earth. And I likewise trembled for myself at that eternal anger, and for
each sinful one from God himself, and how the mighty Lord, all men’s kin will
divide and judge through his secret might.] (ll. 10-20)\(^{28}\)

\(J\text{DayI}:\)    Ðæt gelimpan sceal:     þætte lagu floweð
flod ofer foldan;     feores bið æt ende
anra gehwylcum.     Oft mæg se þe wile
in his sylfes sefan     soð geþencan.

[It shall happen: that a flood of water will flow over the earth; life, for every man,
will be at an end. He who wishes to may think upon this truth in his own mind.]
\((J\text{DayI} \text{ll. } 1-4)\)

The only similarity between \(J\text{DayI}\) to \(Ch\text{rIII}\) and \(J\text{DayII}\) is found in the opening statement of the
poem where the coming Judgement is referred to as a gnomic statement of fact: \(Ðæt\ gelimpan\)
sceal ‘it shall happen’ (l. 1, \(J\text{DayI}\)), where the poet also references the apocalyptic flood and fire,
two of the few signs of Doomsday to be included in the poem (see further discussion, above).
Even references to the coming Judgement in poems such as \(Exo\), \(And\) and \(SoulI\), where the
central theme is not that of Doomsday, afford this statement more imaginative flair than the poet
of \(J\text{DayI}\):

\(Exo:\)    Eftwyrd cymð,
mægenþrymma mæst     ofer middangeard,
dæg dædum fah.     Drihten sylfa
on þam meðelstede     manegum demeð,
þonne he soðfæstra     sawla lædeð,
edige gastas,     on uprodor,
þær is leoft and lif,     eac þon lissa blæd (ll. 540b-46b)

[The day of fate is coming over the earth, mightiest power, in labour with deeds. The
Lord himself will measure out doom in the meeting-place when he leads the ranks of the

\(^{28}\) Translation adapted from Lumby (1876, repr.1964).
righteous on, the happy souls, to heaven above where there is light and life and a limitless joy.] (ll. 540b-46b)

And:

Soð þæt gecyðed
mænig æt meðle on þam myclan dæge,
þæt æt geweorðed, þæt ðeos wlitige gesceaft,
heofon ond eorðe, hreosaþ togadore,
ær awæged sie worda ænig
þe ic þurh minne muð meðlan onginne.

[Many will testify it to be true at the assembly on the great day, that it will come to pass that this beautiful creation, heaven and earth, will collapse together, before any word is annulled which I have spoken from my mouth.] (ll. 1435b-40b)

SoulI:

Huru, ðæs behofað hæleða æghwylc
þæt he sawle sið sylfa geþence,
hu þæt bið deoplic þonne se deað cynd, asyndreð þa sybbe þe ær samod wæron, liç ond sawle! Lang bið syððan
þæt se gast nimeð æt gode sylfum
swa wite swa wuldor, swa him on worulde ær
efne þæt eorðfæt ær geworhete.

[Certainly it is necessary for every man to consider for himself the journey his soul will have to make, how terrible it will be when death comes, and separates the kinsmen who once were joined: the soul and the body. After that, there will be a long time in which the soul receives from God himself either torment or glory, depending on exactly what its earthly enclosure has earned for it earlier on, in the world.] (ll. 5b-8b)

Though the JDayI poet refers to the separation of the soul and body (cf SoulI), the end of the world (cf. And), the salvation of the pure souls (cf Exo), and the event of Judgement itself (cf ChrIII and JDayII above), the references are much shorter and scattered throughout the poem. Where these references to these elements are used on more than one occasion, they are without the detail of SoulI, And, Exo, ChrIII or JDayII. An accepted belief in the event of Judgement is important to the focus of JDayI, and a prerequisite for discussing the theme within these poems more generally, but establishing this belief is not the focus for the poet: he has no

29 Translation from Love (2002: 634).
31 Translation taken from Shippey (1976). See also ll. 5b-8b SoulII.
need to recount the signs of Doomsday. Rather, stating that Judgement is coming is enough for him to then be able to focus on emphasising his purpose – that is, to teach mankind to meditate upon their sins in the face of the coming Doomsday. This he emphasises in his opening lines: *Oft mæg se þe wile | in his sylfes sevan soð gepencan:* ‘He who wishes to may think upon this truth in his own mind’ (l. 3b-4). By using the Last Judgement as his backdrop, therefore, the poet uses the image of flood, fire and the descriptions of mankind to emphasise this central aim.

In a bid to further understand this abstract structure, Bolton (1946) and Shippey (1976) classify the poem within the genre of wisdom literature (or gnomic poetry), linking *JDayI* to texts such as *Vain, Prec, MaxI* and *II, SoulI and II, Sat* and most importantly for the scope of this thesis, *ResA* and *ResB*. Discussion of this classification follows.

### 2.2.2 *JDayI* as Gnomic Poetry

B. C. Williams (1914, repr. 1966) in her discussion of the genre, defines gnomic poetry as,

> in general, a gnome is a sententious saying; in particular it may be proverbial figurative, moral [...] a short, pithy story of a general truth; a proverb, maxim, aphorism or apophthegm. [...] It is] a universal form of literature which [...] celebrates natural phenomena of the world [and] is employed for purposes of teaching: it promulgates principles of law and morality. (1966: 2-6; 80)

Gnomic literature can therefore be understood as falling into two categories: the natural gnome, concerning itself with the natural world and man’s relation to it, and the human gnome, which provide a guide to man’s conduct as a social being. *JDayI* belongs to the latter. Of the genre, relating to Old English and Old Icelandic poetry in particular, Larrington states,

> The most striking characteristic of Germanic wisdom poetry is the apparently unstructured nature of its content: a ready flow of statements which nevertheless proceeds both by sharp breaks and contrasts, and by variations on a single theme. The resulting problems of coherence and unity which confront the scholar are inherent in the genre itself. On close reading, it is evident that the poems are not random agglomerations of gnomes: the constituent gnomes or maxims may be carefully shaped, then these units are integrated, sometimes by means of a large external framework, [...] sometimes by a smaller ‘local’ structure [...] Elsewhere the poem unfolds through verbal or thematic links, subtle modulations from one stanza to the next, or sometimes
the range of thought is extended through unexpected juxtapositions of images. An aesthetic impulse is always at work in the organization of the wisdom poem: with no inherent logical or chronological order, its structure becomes symphonic in character. Themes are taken up, allowed to drop, returned to in a different key or tempo, modulated until resolution is finally reached. (1993: 220)

In other words, the abstract structure of wisdom poetry is comparable to that of *JDayI*, so often the cause of its neglect and criticism: it is central to its form. As Cavill explains, the issue with these texts is not with their style but with our expectations of coherence: ‘we demand […] and then do not find’ (Cavill 1999: 158). He continues: ‘the attempt to find a narrative, or allegory, or consistent and coherent ‘logical’ development is misguided. The style of wisdom literature […] is suggestive of *connections*; its coherence is as an outline of a world view’ (Cavill 1999: 159, emphasis mine). As will be shown below, many of the poem’s motifs can actually be seen to have a notional structure, through which the aim of the poet is displayed.

Though she does not include an analysis of *JDayI*, Larrington’s monograph on wisdom poetry directs the reader to Shippey’s edition of the poem as part of his ‘Poems of Wisdom and Learning in Old English’.32 In this monograph, Shippey presents his texts as a way of allowing ‘some of Henry Sweet’s and James Bright’s “rejects” to reach a wider audience’ (1976: i).33 Of the poems he edits from this genre, he states that the *JDayI* poet’s observation, ‘I mean to teach people all the time’ (*ic a wille leode læran* ll. 46b-47a), is particularly applicable to the group he presents within his edition, which relate to the second category of gnomic literature, the human gnome (see discussion, above), and which

aim primarily neither at narrative nor at self-expression, but deal instead with the central concerns of human life – what it is; how it varies; how a man may hope to succeed in it, and after it.’ (1976: 1)

Shippey characterises these poems as including gnomic generalisations, where the poet is found

---

32 Though *JDayI* is not included in her analysis of wisdom poetry, Larrington’s monograph is of great use as a point of comparison for *JDayI* to other gnomic poetry. I include reference to her work below.

33 Shippey’s (1976) monograph includes editions of *Prec, Vain, Fort, MaxI, MaxII, MRune, MSol, Soul, Desc, JDayI*. Though his edition does not include any study of the following poems, he extends the genre of wisdom poetry to *Wan, Gifts, OrW, Rim, SoulI, Deor, and ResA* and *B* from the Exeter Book and *Alms* and *HomFrII* from the Vercelli Book, along with *JDayII* and *Exhort* from other manuscripts.
to make direct appeals to his audience.\textsuperscript{34} This is certainly true of \textit{JDayI}, which Shippey includes as the last poem of his edition. Indeed, Shippey says of the poem that ‘it is in \textit{JDayI} that the Anglo-Saxon poets’ preoccupation with prudential wisdom reaches its zenith’ (1976: 43). Fukuchi (1975) develops Williams’ classification of the genre, and presents four types of gnomic poetry, arguing that Williams’ original classification is too haphazard and unsystematic. He defines his four types as:

\begin{itemize}
\item[i.] the self-contained gnome
\textit{embodies a complete idea in or of itself}
\item[ii.] the dependent gnome
\textit{always a subordinate clause, is context-sensitive and has a quality of admonition and advice}
\item[iii.] the imperative gnome
\textit{exhortative and has the general form of advice or warning}
\item[iv.] the gnome of direct address
\textit{a sententious saying spoken by one character to another}
\end{itemize}

(Fukuchi 1975: 610-12)

Of these, \textit{JDayI} appears to best fit the third category described by Fukuchi as ‘basically exhortative and has the general voice of an advice, a warning, or the like (1975: 611).\textsuperscript{35} On the surface, \textit{JDayI} certainly appears to belong to the genre of wisdom literature rather more easily than it does the Judgement Day genre. Where the poem was previously criticised for its lack of narrative structure, Shippey points out that when considered within the wisdom literature genre ‘in comparison with the gnomic verse, Judgement Day I seems almost well-shaped’ (1976: 43). Certainly, Bolton reveals that though \textit{JDayI} is commonly criticised for its repetitive nature, generalization and lack of structure, it does in fact show a ‘notional’ order, whereby the poet’s thoughts are associated loosely and ‘chronological eschatology has been abandoned in favour of a conceptual scheme’ (1965: 131). As Bolton demonstrates, the poet draws the audience into this scheme through use of a number of phrases interspersed throughout (\textit{nis þæt lýtulu spærc; to geheganne; ond se bið wide cuð; oncwep nu þisne cwide} (ll. 8b-9a; 44b; 114a)); thus it is this abstract nature of the poem which helps us to understand the aim of the \textit{JDayI} poet, and further to view it within the wisdom literature genre.

\textsuperscript{34} He also characterises them as usually being around one hundred lines in length, which is also true of \textit{JDayI} (119 lines).

\textsuperscript{35} Though Fukuchi only considers gnomic statements in Old English, rather than full texts functioning as part of a genre, and only takes his examples from \textit{And}, it is still interesting to note how \textit{JDayI} fits the basic parameters he sets.
The opening lines of *JDayI* can themselves be considered gnomic statements:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Dæt gelimpan sceal:} & \quad \text{þætte lagu floweð} \\
\text{flod ofer foldan;} & \quad \text{feores bið æt ende} \\
\text{anra gehwylcum.} & \quad \text{Of ðæm se þe wile} \\
\text{in his sylfes sefan} & \quad \text{soð geþencan.}
\end{align*}
\]

[It shall happen: that a flood of water will flow over the earth; life, for every man, will be at an end. He who wishes to may think upon this truth in his own mind.] 

(*JDayI* ll. 1-4)\(^{36}\)

On the one hand Judgement Day will happen and everyone will die; on the other, anyone who wishes to may think about this truth; an expression which reflects a socially-defined worldview.\(^{37}\) As Shippey explains:

> both statements are [...] similar in implication though different in form: what the poet means is that even if a man does not want to reflect on this truth, it will happen just the same – though then his failure to appreciate gnomic understatement will have serious consequences. (1976: 44)

Cavill (1998) makes a similar statement in his extended treatment of the Exeter *Maxims*, noting that the maxims are ‘generalisations which implicitly compare the specified situation with a normal, observable or morally proper order of affairs (1998: 632). In *JDayI*, the generalization is that everyone will die; the normal observable or morally proper order of affairs are the actions of the types of man, and the references to real-life experiences of nature, reimagined as significant motifs within the context of Judgement (fire, flood, heat, light and dark, for example).\(^{38}\) It is this juxtaposition of and movement between the inescapable event of the Apocalypse in the future

\(^{36}\) Use of *sceal* in these lines is typical of gnomic statements. See Remly (1971: 152); Larrington (1993: 132); and cf. ll. 17b-23a of the Cotton *Maxims* and *MaximsII* of the Exeter Book.

\(^{37}\) Cavill (1998: 631). Cavill makes this statement in reference to maxims more generally, though it is certainly true here within the context of the opening lines of *JDayI*, as is his following statement; he continues: ‘their voice [i.e. of the maxims] is of received opinion, and they appeal either to human norms or divine omnipotence. They are, therefore, unchallengeable.’ (1998: 632). The maxims referred to here are the Exeter *Maxims*, though the gnomic statements of *JDayI* also apply. The poet does not use his text to convince his audience of the truth of the Last Judgement; the inevitability of the event of Judgement is a firm belief that the poet establishes in these opening lines. He uses this belief as the backdrop for his aim: to teach the audience to consider their souls in the face of this inevitability.

\(^{38}\) This juxtaposition between the human and the natural is discussed in relation to the Exeter and Cotton *Maxims* in the following section.
and the uncomprehending present that sets out the poet’s subsequent structure for his work and which Shippey argues serves to connect the reader to the subject (1976: 44). The poet’s use of repetition and variation of description serves to emphasise that the past, judged at Doomsday, is our present and our present deeds are our future Judgement. This abstract structure acts as a repeated reminder that man’s Judgement is decided now rather than a recounting of apocalyptic events: each reminder further emphasises the brief present of man and the eternal present of God. Hell is forever standing open for those who sin in the present (cf. ll. 24-34) just as heaven stands ever ready for those who have the foresight to think deeply on their deeds. As Bloomfield states,

The purpose of wisdom and its literature is to suggest a scheme of life in the broadest sense of the word, to ensure its continuance, to predict its variations and to associate humanity with the fundamental rhythms of nature. It is an attempt to control life by some kind of order, to reduce the area of the unexpected and the sudden. (1968: 17)

By having the audience meditate on their fate in the present, the suddenness of Judgement when it arrives will be lessened; the audience will be prepared.

2.2.2.1 JDayI: The Poem’s Abstract Structure as Wisdom Literature
The abstract manner in which the poet sets out this information lends itself to a classification of the poem within the wisdom literature tradition: the poem does not simply offer advice for the reader, but rather prompts the deep thinking that the audience must embark upon in order to secure their salvation. In a similar way MaxI, also of the Exeter Book, presents its structure by linking thoughts via a notional order. This has subsequently been deemed less coherent than its MaxII counterpart, the second maxim beginning as it does with ‘a series of elemental and seasonal oppositions which have proved not quite neat enough for some tastes [while the third] though it wanders round the theme of friends and friendlessness, looks distinctly haphazard’ (Shippey 1976: 17). Earl (1983) says,

The received opinion of the “Maxims” is too unhappy to rehearse at length. Blanche Williams […] concluded “It is a plausible deduction, therefore, one hardly to be avoided, that the writer of these lines was performing an exercise in verse technic”. Dobbie notes

39 Bolton (1965: 131) links the ‘notional order’ of JDayI to that of MaxI.
“an almost complete lack of ordered arrangement […] The entire text gives the impression of a mass of unrelated materials gathered from a number of sources, and assembled by the compiler more or less mechanically, with no attempt at selection or logical arrangement”. Wrenn says “They show no marked poetic quality […] The compiler seems merely to have set down whatever occurred to him of the heterogeneous and sententious material he remembered […] Maxims I are a mere string of disconnected gnomic statements”. It would be unwise to argue too strongly that these opinions are entirely unfounded; but they are rather too extreme. (1983: 277)

The comparison to the critical reception of JDayI is striking. Only the first part of MaxI seems to impress. MaxII appear to have a similar problem; the third section appears not to be in gnomic form and has ‘proved a great stumbling block to many editors’ understanding of the poem in its entirety’ (Bollard 1973: 180). As Bollard goes on to argue, the three sections of the Cotton Maxims do indeed function together to provide a text that describes the ordering of nature and society. Similarly, Larrington states of the last of the Exeter Maxims,

Highly disparate in content, the connections between one thought and the next in the final movement of Exeter Maxims are virtually impossible to trace; the first two sections […] it is possible to trace the movement of the thought […] it is less easy to trace a logical ordering in the final section […] (1993: 127; 129).

The outcome of the second and third section of MaxI is in fact remarkably similar to the aim of the JDayI poet – the wise man is the one who thinks on, accepts and endures hardships as part of God’s divine will rather than ignoring or reproving them (cf. the first two depictions of man in JDayI). Both poems share common ground by opening with exhortations to their audience and where implication to an overarching theme or focus throughout is coherent, though subsequently the structure may appear to be lost. Similarly, Sat, Rune, Prec, Vain and Fort all share an overarching theme that man should expect all the hardships of this world as part of God’s divine plan but take confidence in the fact that it is possible to place oneself on the side of right at the end of the world, which is indeed the focus of the JDayI poet. As Cavill states, maxims are ‘elicited by situations of conflict to invoke a sense of order where chaos threatens’ (1998: 631).

In her study of gnomic theme and style in Old Icelandic and Old English poetry, Larrington

---

40 The quotes given in the citation from Earl are as follows: Williams (1914:109); Krapp and Dobbie (1936: xlvii-xlvii); Wrenn (1967: 165-66).
(1993: 120) categorises *JDayI* as part of the wisdom literature genre, but specifically as a ‘doctrinal poem’ which comments on Christian morality. In her chapter ‘Old English Wisdom Poetry: its Range and Themes’ she considers only those Old English poems which are primarily concerned with imparting wisdom and use the gnome as a structural unit: the Exeter and Cotton *Maxims; Fort; Rune; Prec; SolII*. Though her study does not include the poem *JDayI* in any detail, her work on the *Maxims* is of use here. In her discussion of *MaxI* and *MaxII*, Larrington describes the associational link between the two texts, which is similar to that employed as a structural technique throughout *JDayI*:

at least in the first two sections, 1–70 and 71–137, it is possible to trace the movement of the thought: there is generally an associational link between one subject and the next, either of similarity or of contrast (1993: 129)

*MaxI* and *II* in particular employ nature (*forst sceal frēosan fy r wudu meltan, | eor pe growan is brycgian*: ‘Frost must freeze, fire consume wood, the earth put forth growth, ice form a bridge’ *MaxII* ll. 71–2) and human gnomes (*e.g.* *cyning bið anwealdes georn | lað se þe londes monað leof se þe mare beoded*: ‘A king is eager for authority; hateful is he who denies him land, dear is he who offers more’ *MaxI* ll. 59b–60); this provides the texts with an authenticity, reinforcing the authority of the gnomes (Larrington 1993: 129-30).41 In a similar way, *JDayI* uses the images of man alongside references to familiar things in nature (fire and heat, in particular, but also light, dark etc.) a) to draw attention to how these familiarities will signify Doomsday and Judgement; and b) to give authenticity to the teachings in the poem; the events the poet discusses are not removed from the everyday experiences of the audience, but common motifs which come to mean something else. As Remly states: ‘the elements of nature […] represent absolute, irreducible reality’ (1971: 151); though the events of Judgement Day may seem removed from mankind in the present, the references to these natural experiences (flood, fire and so on) and human experiences (the types of man) are concepts based in their own worldly experience that they can all comprehend, which therefore function to bring the reality of the future Judgement to the present.

---

41 Translations of gnomes are also from Larrington, here (1993: 129-30).
Just as I argue that *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB* should be understood as individual poems as well as a thematic unit, so Hansen argues the *MaximsI* could be read:

the ambiguous integrity of A, B, and C might suggest the open-ended nature of wisdom […] Perhaps we are invited by the problematic status of the Exeter Book gnomic poem(s) to take the experience of one section or poem as complete and hence meaningful in its own right, and also to consider that, as the opening lines of A suggest, the wise can and will generate a continuing series of such artefacts (Hansen 1988: 176, cited in Larrington 1993: 232)

One such way of reading *JDayI* first as a coherent text, and second alongside *ResA* and *ResB* as a unit, is via the use of a specific theme common to all three. Lochrie (1986a) argues that, in addition to this apparent overarching theme of gnomic literature, it is the poet’s reference to *wyrd* above all other themes that uphold the gnomic classification of *JDayI* and helps emphasise the central message within its abstract structure. Further, in her article on *wyrd* in *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB* (1986b), she argues that all three poems represent varying approaches to the common concern of *wyrd* and its effect upon mankind, in particular, man’s inability to comprehend ‘the operation of *wyrd* in his daily life and the human endeavour to live meaningfully in the face of the comprehension’ (1986b: 324), which echoes the overarching themes expressed in the gnomic literature discussed above. Of *JDayI* in particular, she argues that the three portrayals of man all point to ‘prudence’ as the remedy for each of their sins; fear of the Last Judgement and prudence are one and the same for the poet and the appropriate human response to *wyrd*, she argues, is prudence itself (1986b: 328-29). As the author of one of the very few article-length publications to discuss *JDayI*, it is important here to discuss her reading of the poem further.

2.2.3 *JDayI* and the Theme of *Wyrd*

The concept of *wyrd* has been the subject of much debate amongst scholars;\(^\text{42}\) the word itself was absorbed into Christian thought expressed in Old English texts from the pagan concept of *wyrd* as (the goddess of) fate, ‘destiny’, suggesting that the events of man’s life are predetermined and thus out of his control (Timmer 1941a; Timmer 1941b). In *JDayI*, as with most other religious Old English texts, the use of *wyrd* can be understood in the fully Christian sense and therefore

---

\(^{42}\) For further discussion of the use of *wyrd* in Old English prose and poetry see Timmer (1941a and 1941b) respectively. For information on the pagan and Christian use of *wyrd* see Stanley (1964: I-IX) and for discussions of the use of *wyrd* in *Beo* specifically see, among others, Weil (1989), Kasik (1979).
refers to divine providence, or to God himself; after the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to Christianity, the new creed had no use for a belief in a blind fate that governed the lives of men. Wyrd passed from pagan into Christian usage, and was understood as the inevitability of events as made subject to God. In JDayI, the content is wholly Christian and therefore the pagan concepts of wyrd relevant in poems such as Beo need not detain us. However, even within the wholly Christian context of the poem, wyrd in Old English prose and poetry can be defined in one of the following ways depending on context:

- death
- fate or destiny (as ruled by the pagan goddess of Fate)
- that which happens to man (in the Christian sense), the events of his life, his lot
- chance, or accidental happenings
- divine providence, or that which is subject to God
- a miraculous event or deed including the Apocalypse as a miraculous event

(Timmer 1941b: 213-28).

In this way, the use of the word and concept wyrd as expressed in JDayI is important. To understand how and why the poet uses it in the poem, and to explore Lochrie’s (1986a) argument that wyrd is central to the poem’s structure and genre classification, it is necessary to determine whether the poet is referring either to chance events as they happen to man, or to divine providence, as known by God. Alternatively, the references to wyrd in the text could simply refer to the Apocalypse as a ‘miraculous event’ (see: Timmer 1941a; Timmer 1941b) and not to man’s lot at all. The importance of this lies in the main concern the poet is trying to emphasise throughout the poem, that man must take responsibility for his own actions, and meditate deeply upon his sinful deeds in order to be saved. If these events had been simply the work of fate, in the pagan sense, man could not accept responsibility for his soul or therefore his Judgement; equally, if the events have occurred by chance, or are accidental, even in the Christian sense, we need to determine if man is to be considered responsible for them in their entirety at the Last Judgement to understand the poet’s concern with wyrd and its effect on mankind. The use of both the word and the concept of wyrd in JDayI is understood by Lochrie (1986b) as the final conflagration and Last Judgement.43 The themes of the event of the Last Judgement and God’s providence are combined with those described previously – the apocalyptic fire of doomsday and hell and the purgative apocalyptic flood – to provide the poem with a thematic frame within

43 Lochrie does not, however, distinguish between word and concept when referring to wyrd in her argument.
which the portraits of mankind appear. By bringing each of these elements together, the poet is able to emphasise his main concern: that mankind must think well now in order to be rewarded by God at the Last Judgement.

2.2.3.1 *JDayI*: Uses of *Wyrd*

The poet uses the word *wyrd* twice in *JDayI*, in ll. 82a and 115b. Each instance occurs either within or just after the description of the deep-thinking man. Additionally, each appears after the sectional division indicated by an enlarged, decorated initial *wynn* that occurs at l. 81 in the manuscript. The first use of *wyrd* (l. 82a) refers to God’s divine providence, which will repay the deep-thinking soul for reflecting upon his sins so that he may endure his Judgement well; the second, at l. 115b, refers to the Apocalypse itself, the ‘event under the heavens’. In effect, both uses centre around the divine providence of God who knows the deeds of all men before they occur and who has decreed the events of the Apocalypse: both occurrences of *wyrd* are intrinsically linked and both concepts are used as thematic structural devices in illuminating the poet’s message, alongside his use of fire, meditation and the characterizations of man. Although the actual word *wyrd* only occurs twice, the concept is prevalent throughout the poem: in order to emphasise the importance of human understanding and deep reflection, the terrors of the event of the Apocalypse and the power of God’s providence foreground much of the description of mankind in the poem, and both concepts are present within each description of the three types of man.

To understand how the two occurrences of *wyrd* also function to express key concepts in the poem, we must examine how the poet uses them in relation to the three portraits of man. Our first portrait, the *gromhydig* man (ll. 12-29), is prefaced by reference to the conflagration:

\[
\text{bið eal þes ginna grund} \quad \text{gleda gefyll,} \\
\text{reþra bronda}
\]

*[All this wide world will be full of glowing embers, cruel firebrands]* (JDayI ll. 12-13a)
The land which is burned completely by the apocalyptic fire is earth as ruled by these *gromhydge* men: their evil deeds and the subsequent event of the Last Judgement are detailed side-by-side, linking one to the other. The image of the doomsday fire returns again four lines later:

> Him biþ fyr ongean, droflic wite.

*The fire will be for them, tormenting punishment.* (JDayI II. 18b-19a)

This further emphasises that the doomsday fire is for these men, before detailing the torments of Hell the damned will suffer at the Last Judgement:

> þær næfre dæg scineð
leohte of lyfte, ac a bilocen stondeð,
siþpan þæs gæstes gryre agiefan weorþed.

_Ufan hit is enge ond hit is innan hat;

nis þæt betlic bold, ac þær is bronga hyhst,
ne noht hyhtlic ham, ac þæt is helle grund,
sarlic siðfæt þa þe sibbe ful oft
tomældeð mid his muþe._

*There day never shines with the light of the sky, but it stands shut forever, when the fate of the souls is given. It is oppressive above, and hot within; that is no grand dwelling place, but the greatest terrors are there, no joyous home, but a miserable journey to the abyss of hellfire to those who frequently destroy peace by spreading tales with his mouth.* (ll. 19b-26a)

The poet then refers to God’s divine providence within the context of the limits of man’s knowledge of the terrors of hell: hell stands eternally for the *gromhydig* man who will be cast down at the Last Judgement; though man may not know it on earth, God knows how he will suffer his final Judgement. The poet then continues to ask who can ever be wise enough that they can describe what God has designed for mankind, the heights of heaven, which God has standing ready for those who are saved:

> Hwa is þonne þæs forðgleaw,  opþe þær fela cunne,
þæt æfre mæge heofona  heahþu greccan,
swa georne þone godes dæl,  swa he gearo stondeð
clænum heortum,  þam þe þisne cwide willað
ondrædan þus deopne?
[Who has a mind wise enough, or knows so much, that he can ever describe the glory of heaven, that great amount, so eagerly, as it stands prepared for those pure of heart who are willing to fear the wisdom of this utterance?] (JDayI ll. 30-34a).

In this way the events of the Last Judgement, here specific to the damned soul, are described alongside reference to God’s divine providence. It is within this description that we find the portrait of the *gromhydig* man. By describing the sinful soul and his lack of wisdom on earth within the context of *wyrd* in both senses used later in the poem, the poet is highlighting the man’s lack of thinking which will bring about the damnation he describes.

Similarly, the second portrait of man wanton with feasting is prefaced by detail of the coming event of the Last Judgement; in effect, the poet links the first portrait to the second through this description (ll. 34b-68). By describing man at his final Judgement, and juxtaposing the portrait of the *gromhydig* man with detail that all mankind’s sins will be made known and only the pure will be saved, the poet is able to begin his second portrait, where man has knowledge of heaven and an awareness of the Last Judgement. However, this portrait is still of a sinful soul: though this man has thought upon his final days, he has not done so properly, or, indeed, deeply enough. This man thinks on this very little as he feasts and enjoys earthly pleasures, not thinking of how things will come to pass after this world (ll. 77b-80). He believes he will be sent to heaven when he has performed no good deeds or contrition to repent for his sinful ways. The poet places side-by-side the divine providence of God who knows this man is to be ‘assigned to the troop on the left’ (*þæt he bið on þæt wynstre weorud wyrs gescaden þonne he on þa swiþran hond swican mote leahtra alysed* ll. 75-77a), with the man’s own poorly-conceived knowledge that he can alter *wyrd* under God. In other words, he believes he can change the effect of God’s providence upon his own life. As with our first portrait, this description is prefaced by detail of the event of Judgement Day alongside reference to God’s plans for mankind and higher knowledge of his Judgement. Once again, these two concepts of *wyrd* are brought together to frame a description that allows the audience to deeper understand the importance of thinking well.
The final portrait, of the deep-thinking soul, is introduced at l. 81 where, for the first time in the poem, we see the poet using the word *wyrd*, here referring to God’s divine providence. The emphasis on the poet’s concern with thinking well is provided through the description of God repaying his good deeds at the Last Judgement:

\[
\text{him þæt þonne geleanað lifes waldend,} \\
\text{heofona hyrde, æfter heonansciþe} \\
\text{godum dædum, þæs þe he swa geomor wearð,} \\
\text{sarig fore his synnum.}
\]

[The Ruler of Life, Guardian of Heaven, will then repay him his good deeds, after his death, because he was so grieved, sorry for his sins.] (JDayI ll. 85-88a)

This description, repeated twice between ll. 81 and 88a, emphasises not only the rewards of thinking deeply, but prefaces the further references to God’s plan for mankind where God is described as having prepared a place in heaven for those souls who think deeply, building a great hall for those who are saved, and adorning it in splendor:

\[
\text{Ne sceal se to sæne beon ne þissa larna to læt, se þe him wile lifgan mid gode,} \\
\text{brucan þæs boldes þe us beorht fæder} \\
\text{gearwað togeanes, ðæs þe þone sele frætweð,} \\
\text{timbreð torhtlice; to sculon clæne,} \\
\text{womma lease, swa se waldend cwæð,} \\
\text{ealra cyninga cyning.}
\]

[He who wishes to live with God, enjoy the home which the Glorious Father, Lord of Souls, prepares for us, must not be too negligent nor too slow in (following) these teachings. He is the Lord of Victory who adorns that hall, builds it in splendour for the pure, free from sin; so says the Lord, King of all Kings.] (JDayI ll. 88b-95a)

The poet again uses description of that event of the Last Judgement to link the portrait of the deep-thinking man to the poem’s final declaration. Here, the poet calls upon detail of the soul and body reuniting for the final journey at Judgement Day, all summoned to plead before God, who will make known his *wyrd* for mankind, which emphasises for the final time the poet’s main concern. Within the final five lines we have the only other use of the word *wyrd* within the poem,
where it refers to that ‘event under the heavens’ – the event of the Last Judgement itself (l. 115b). In this way, the poet is able to solicit his audience to join him in his acknowledgement of God’s providence and the event of the Last Judgement, as his use of the concept of *wyrd* throughout his poem has served to frame and enhance the message put forth by each portrait: that mankind cannot prevent, change or escape God’s plan for mankind at Judgement Day. The audience must now for themselves repeat that they too are subject to God’s providence, to the burning fire of Doomsday and to their final salvation or damnation, and that only if they think well, will they receive glory with God.

Though *wyrd* is an important conceptual and structural device in *JDayI*, it is not the central concern of the poem, as suggested by Lochrie (1986b). Rather, it is used in combination with other thematic structural devices, such as the images of fire and flood, and the portraits of man, to support the poet’s message that it is only those who meditate deeply on the state of their souls before the Last Judgement who will receive the patience and faith to endure their lot on earth and therefore attain their ultimate reward in heaven. Rather than the portraits of man being three human responses to *wyrd*, as argued by Lochrie (1986b), they are three varying human responses to the limitations of human wisdom in the face of their final Judgement and the eternal state of their souls, and in comparison to God’s divine providence. That *wyrd* can be defined in a number of different ways, though all connected semantically, suggests that to understand the poem purely as a representation of this concept is to ignore the other techniques being used by the poet to teach his audience his main didactic aim:

*Forþon ic a wille leode læran þæt hi lof godes hergan on heahþu, hyhtum to wuldre lifgen on geleafan, ond a lufan dryhtnes wyrca in pisse worulde, ær þon se wlonca dæg*  

*[Therefore, I wish to teach people that they should praise God's glory on high, live in faith with the hope of glory, and always love the Lord's deeds in this world before that day of splendor] (JDayI ll. 46b-50)*

Thus, a classification of *JDayI* as a wisdom poem does help to illuminate what have previously appeared rather unstructured exhortations to mankind on the importance of thinking deeply, interspersed with somewhat unordered details of Judgement Day. What this classification helps
make clear is that the poet is dealing with a problem common to other wisdom poems, such as *SoulI, SoulII* and *Desc*, that he is not simply recounting happenings of a future or past event, as previous classification as a Judgement Day poem might have us believe, but that he is trying to demonstrate the difference such events will make, especially when combined with his central message, intended to stir the audience into action to ultimately affect the outcome of their own Judgement. *SoulII* and *II* are executed in a similar way: the poet describes good and evil as opposites with no intermediate state, where the state of evil and their final Judgement to hell is of more interest in the main description of the poem than that of heaven; he argues for the importance of realising the marked difference between the states of good and evil before it is too late; he argues for the belief that this realization must take place before Judgement Day and in the uselessness of repentance after this event. Similarly, *Desc*, like *SoulI* and *II* and *JDayI*, is more interested in effect than in accuracy (Shippey 1976: 38) and, like *JDayI*, the poet presents an apparent preoccupation with man’s ignorance in the present as compared with God’s superior power and divine providence (*Descent* II. 1-20) and in the idea of the power of a single event (Judgement Day; the resurrection; the harrowing of hell) changing the ignorant belief of mankind. Like that of *JDayI*, the poet of *Descent* makes no apologies for his rehandling of, and omissions from, the ‘traditional’ story. Just as with *JDayI*, previous critics have criticised *Descent* for not following the same structure or narrative detail as *JDayII* and *ChIII*.44

2.3 *JDayI*: Conclusion

This chapter has shown that *JDayI* does share themes and form common to other wisdom poetry, and much can be gained from analysing it alongside other poetry of this genre. However, any medieval text can be understood to have two functions: its original purpose at the point of composition, and its purpose in the manuscript in which it is found. It is therefore worth considering the function of the poem within its immediate manuscript context and its possible relationship to the poems that surround it – namely *ResA* and *ResB*. To this end, an analysis of *ResA* and *ResB* follows, before evidence is presented which supports a reading of all three texts as a thematic or conceptual unit.

---

44 A recent Ph.D. by Mary Rambaran-Olm argues the poem is in fact better understood as a reworking of the life of John the Baptist (forthcoming 2012).
2.4 Thematic Evidence | Resignation A and B

Though *JDayl*, *ResA* and *ResB* are contiguous in the Exeter Book, they could not differ more in the critical attention they have received; where *JDayl* has been rarely anthologised or analysed by scholars (see p. 15ff above), *ResA* and *ResB* have been subject to considerable debate as to their form, function and codicological unity. Throughout their critical history, *ResA* and *ResB* have been included in collections of prayer-like poems while also being classified with the elegies, alongside critically acclaimed poems such as *Wan* and *Sfr*. Often deemed problematic, even muddled texts, *ResA* and *ResB* were previously translated and interpreted as a single poetic unit, where the critic was presented with a seemingly inexplicable change in mode from prayer to dramatic monologue and a sudden, unexpected change in tone of speaker. As a unity, the texts were chiefly interpreted as part of the Old English elegies, due to the inclusion of journey imagery in what is now understood to be *ResB*; the poems are now analysed as two individual, but thematically linked works, separated by a missing folio (at *ResA* l. 70 of edited text, see Frantzen/Bliss 1976), which accounts for the textual disjoint. Since this, a new wave of criticism has examined the texts on an individual basis, and the majority of scholars now believe there to be insufficient evidence to support a reading of either poem as an elegy. Though the codicological evidence offered by Frantzen/Bliss (1976) is now generally accepted as proof these texts are two individual and incomplete poems, some modern scholarship does prevail believing *ResA* and *ResB* to be a single poem with a missing folio at its centre.

The history of scholarship surrounding *ResA* and *ResB* is therefore a complex one, and the texts’ interpretative history must be appreciated in full in order to understand the divergence in modern criticism. Consequently, the following discussion will provide a review of the poems’ critical

---

45 See Figure 1 for full details. Wülker (1894), Brandl (1908), Sieper (1915) and Shücking (1919) include the poems in collections of prayers; Chambers (1933) treats and subsequently titles the poems ‘A Prayer’ as does Mackie (1934); Stanley (1955) titles the poems along the same lines but is the first to draw extended links to *Wan* and *Sfr*. His interpretation has been influential to all subsequent scholarship up to the Frantzen/Bliss discovery (1976); some scholars retain the elegiac links between these three texts despite the evidence put forward by Frantzen/Bliss and this is discussed in further detail below.
history with a résumé of the texts, a critique of the classification of the texts within the elegies, and finally an analysis of subsequent literary interpretations.

2.4.1 ResA and ResB: An Analysis

The many titles of ResA and ResB reflect their complex critical history; just as JDayI has suffered neglect and negative criticism partly as a result of its title (see Section II: JDayI p.15ff), ResA and ResB have been retitled a number of times as different interpretations of the texts were put forward. In an attempt to resolve the textual disjoints found between ResA and ResB, this practice has continued into more recent scholarship, where fresh codicological evidence was adduced and the texts reassessed anew. The following table demonstrates the title changes from 1842 to 2000:46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>A Supplication</td>
<td>1842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wülker</td>
<td>Gebete</td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandl</td>
<td>Gebet des Vertriebenen</td>
<td>1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sieper</td>
<td>Klage eines Vertriebenen</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shücking</td>
<td>Kleines ags Dichterbuch</td>
<td>1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>A Prayer</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackie</td>
<td>The Exile’s Prayer</td>
<td>1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krapp/Dobie</td>
<td>Resignation</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>The Penitent’s Prayer</td>
<td>1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>The Penitent’s Prayer</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frantzen/Bliss</td>
<td>Resignation A and Resignation B</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulsiano</td>
<td>The Penitent’s Prayer and the Penitent’s Lament</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muir</td>
<td>Contrition A and Contrition B</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Changes in title of ResA and ResB 1842–2000

---

46 Figure 1 also includes titles of collections of poems within which ResA and ResB were included. See previous note, above.
Though the variation shown here indicates the changes in critical reception of the texts over time, the pervading interpretative trend seems to view the two texts, as a unity, as a prayer. Of the thirteen titles, or classifications above, seven specify ‘prayer’ to be the form of ResA and ResB. Despite this, the majority of scholarship has focused on the imagery of an exile’s journey found in the monologue of the latter lines of ResB; consequently the texts have been used as an interpretative aid for other elegies, namely Sfr (see Stanley 1955). However, only one title expresses this specific content: Mackie’s The Exile’s Prayer (1934). None of the remaining titles convey the monologue form of ResB until Pulsiano in 1995: The Penitent’s Lament. The generally accepted titles today are that of Frantzen/Bliss: Resignation A and Resignation B (1976), adapted only slightly from Krapp/Dobbie’s (1936) suggestion, Resignation. Both Krapp/Dobbie and Frantzen/Bliss’ titles suggest the mood of the texts; Frantzen/Bliss’ emendation to Resignation A and B acknowledges the previous critical history while demonstrating the more modern interpretation. Their titles Resignation A and Resignation B have subsequently been retained for the purposes of this thesis. 47

A brief résumé of the contents of ResA and ResB is given below. The texts are first summarised using the headings offered by Stanley in his tripartite analysis of the poems as a unity, which can also be understood as being ResA and ResB respectively, with a final note of resignation. Stanley’s structure has been adopted to enable future discussion of the texts, as they have been understood at various points in their critical history. Line numbers given refer to the subsequent re-numbering of ResA and ResB as individual poems.

2.4.1.1 An Informal Confession and a Penitent’s Prayer (ResA: ll.1-69)
The opening lines of ResA set the tone for this poem, where the speaker of the prayer makes a direct plea to God for forgiveness (ResA ll. 1-2a). The speaker presents himself as a penitent man who is aware of his sins and of the penance he must pay to secure redemption; indeed, much of the first thirty lines of ResA are devoted to this topic. Within these first lines the poet’s main

47 Muir (1999; 2000) suggests the titles Contrition A and B arguing the poems fit into the Confiteor tradition. However, the Frantzen/Bliss titles are the best-known and used in scholarship of the poems, hence the reason Muir’s titles have not been adopted in this thesis.
aims are made clear: the speaker asks to be shown in what manner of life it is best for him to observe the will of God (ResA ll. 5-15). The speaker is presented not as an exemplary Christian, but as a human figure that readily admits he has sinned throughout life (ResA ll. 16b-18; 27b-28). Yet despite this, he shows an awareness of the state of his soul and feels a need to seek forgiveness for his transgressions before death. He views God as all-knowing (ResA ll. 25b-26a) but most importantly has faith that God is merciful (ResA ll. 19-20a; 26b-27a). He commits himself to God entirely (ResA ll. 5-9), mindful of atonement that God will send him and prays for the understanding to endure any trials of penance in order to secure his redemption (ResA ll. 20b-25a). The speaker does not expect God to grant him reprieve from his sins, but fully expects he must earn his salvation and, further, he understands that in order to gain eternal life he must seek another way of life on earth (ResA ll. 29-34a). Stanley (1955) contends that the remainder of ResA and ResB (as a unity) is about this alternative way of life: that this is not simply the prayer of a generally penitent man, but a man who knows his death is fast approaching. The speaker is very much a man who has thought well upon his life on earth, identified his sinful deeds and who seeks absolution from God before his death (ResA ll. 42b-44). In many ways, ResA can be read as a prayer for the dying, a commendatio animae\textsuperscript{48} and mirrors the message exemplified by the well-thinking man described in JDayI (l. 80ff).

2.4.1.2 The Exile and his Pilgrimage (ResA and ResB: ll. 1-41)

It is from this point that the speaker changes his outlook (ResA 1.70; ResB 1.1ff); in ResA a repentant sinner, we see in ResB a man beset by life’s hardships, ignorant of the role he plays in his sufferings on earth (ResB ll. 8b-11). God is no longer the merciful judge the speaker addressed in ResA, but is now a wrathful ruler who punishes sinners rather than providing an opportunity for them to repent. The speaker transforms from a man who acknowledges his sins and looks towards his penance with acceptance, to a man who bemoans his poverty on earth, his exile from his home and friends, and who laments his youth (ResB ll. 14b-21a). The speaker then enters into a short digression of six lines (of edited text) in which he talks of a man (whom he refers to in the third person, placing at a distance from himself) who has angered God, who laments his youth, whose misery is only exacerbated by the charity of others and who suffers a

\textsuperscript{48} See Marie Nelson (1983).
distressed mind. Only then does the speaker inform us that he relates this tale of woe (sarspel, ResB l. 26b) mainly about himself, sad with longing (longunge fus, ResB l. 98a), he speaks about a journey (ymb sip sprece, ResB l. 27b) and thinks of the ocean (on lagu pence, ResB l. 28b). It is at this stage, almost thirty lines into ResB, that the image of a journey or pilgrimage is introduced. However detail of this journey appears in a somewhat abstract manner: the only detail provided by the speaker is that he has not enough money to buy a boat, or fare, upon the sea and no friend to help him with his voyage. A seafaring journey along the lines of Wan and Sfr this is not: the journey alluded to here is never realised in the remaining lines of the text, and neither does the speaker show any awareness of what fate may befall him next: he is entirely preoccupied with the present. His tone remains the same throughout, one of negativity, vexation, and unhappiness, a man who believes his fate remains purely with God, and not with himself.

2.4.1.3 A Final Message of Resignation (ResB: ll. 42-48)
Stanley (1955) identifies the speaker’s final message of resignation as beginning at l. 42, though in fact this message actually comprises no more than the last two lines: giet biþ þæt selast þonne mon him sylf ne mæg / wyrd onwendan þæt he þonne wel þolige: ‘Yet it is best that, when a man cannot change his fate himself, that he endure it well’ (ResB ll. 47-48). Nevertheless, a mood of resignation is prevalent throughout ResA and ResB. The speaker of the first part (ResA ll. 1-70) has resigned himself to do penance in order to absolve his sins, the speaker of the second (ResB ll. 1-48), though unaware of his own responsibilities towards his redemption, is nonetheless resigned to his unhappy life on earth, though he bemoans his existence. It is fitting, therefore, that the final lines should also show a tone of resignation. What is jarring here, however, is that these final two lines better fit the speaker of part one, rather than that of part two: it is odd that a man who takes no responsibility for his own happiness on earth, or in the life to follow, should conclude by saying man should endure his fate well, whatever it may be, when he has not done so himself. It could be argued that the final message of resignation can be seen seven lines previously, when the speaker states that: is seo bot æt þe / gelong æfter life: ‘remedy is with you

49 For discussion of the semantics of bat see the Glossary and Linguistic Notes to the edition, in Section III, below. Malmberg argues bat refers not to ‘boat’ but to ‘passage’ or ‘fare’ which in turn informs Deskis’ 1998 article which argues the exile of ResB is based on the biblical story of Jonah, between his expulsion from the whale and before his arrival at Nineveh. See discussion below and in Section III: Contextual Evidence for further discussion of these implications on an understanding of the function of the text within the conceptual unit of JDayl, ResA and ResB.
after this life’ (ResB ll. 40b-1a), though the speaker here has resigned himself not to God as judge, but to his belief that God is wholly responsible for his fate. This resignation certainly fits with the speaker we have come to know from this part of the text; he demonstrates similar ill-knowledge and little-thinking that we find with the little-thinking man of JDayI who is aware that his Judgement before God is imminent, but believes he has no responsibility over the outcome.

Stanley marks out this section (ResB ll. 42-48) as the text’s message of resignation, stating:

> the rest of the poem is a straightforward lament of the Penitent in his misery, ending on a note of resignation, which provided the title given by Dobbie to the poem as a whole. (1955: 460)

Krapp/Dobbie’s title Resignation remains the most widely recognised title of the text today and in many ways the mood of resignation marked at the close of ResB is present throughout ResA. Where the speaker of ResB is resigned to his own suffering, ResA shows a speaker who is resigned to the trails God will send him in order to secure his salvation.

2.4.2 ResA and ResB: A Critical History

As stated previously, ResA and ResB were first understood as a single poem, comprising two problematic and distinct components: the prayer of a repentant sinner and the lament of an exile. It is this exiled speaker who has provided the strongest link to the Old English elegies, where the supposed attempt to embark on a journey has been argued to be reminiscent of Wan and Sfr. However, in the case of ResA and ResB, this journey is never realised, enlightenment is never achieved and the journey itself is left ambiguous – either as a physical journey (a penitential pilgrimage) or a spiritual one (the journey of the soul and its sins before death).

The disjointed tone between ResA and ResB has led to myriad interpretations and structural divisions of the text when analysed as a unity. Stanley’s article (1955) is perhaps the most influential, analysing the unit as having a tripartite structure, each section with a specific function: the first a penitential prayer, beginning with an informal confession; the second,
introducing the theme of exile; and finally the third a message of resignation (1955: 456-57).

Stanley’s analysis provides a means by which one can attempt read the poems as a unity and thereby resolve the problems arising from the speaker’s abrupt change in tone (between ResA and ResB). In considering ResA and ResB alongside Wan and Sfr, Stanley identifies what he believes to be the value of the poems – that is, an interpretative tool for the other elegies, Sfr in particular. Stanley’s work has therefore been influential in the classification of ResA and ResB as members of the elegies, and much of the remaining scholarship prior to the Frantzen/Bliss discovery (1976) focuses on the journey imagery of the last twenty lines; the prayer of ResA’s sixty-nine lines was largely ignored, despite being the longer section of ResA and ResB combined. However, the change in tone between the texts remains problematic when analysing them as a unity. What is of interest is that Stanley notes a change from the mode of prayer to monologue, around line 6b of ResB. In doing so, he joins a number of other early scholars in identifying a change in tone between these points in the texts: Sieper (1915: 256) took l. 88 to be the turning point; Krapp/Dobbie (1936: lx) do the same; Schücking (1919: 223) includes an extract of the text of ResB from l. 78 onwards only in his collection, though he indicates in his work that he believes this section to be part of a larger whole; Bestul (1977: 18) marks a change at l. 75a and Prins (1954: 241-42) identifies a new direction at l. 84a. Frantzen/Bliss’s article (1976) revisits the texts in search of a resolution; their subsequent discovery, on consulting the manuscript, resulted in the most significant change to the way ResA and ResB are understood.

Though the influence of Stanley’s article can still be seen in modern scholarship of the texts (see Nelson 1983 and Klinck 1992), it is since Frantzen/Bliss’s article (1976) that the texts have received the most critical attention. Frantzen/Bliss’ codicological examination of the Exeter Book revealed folio loss between f.118r and f.119v (or l. 70 and l. 71 of edited text). The implications of this for ResA and ResB were significant; a once unified but problematic text was now shown to be fragments of two individual poems: the beginning of the prayer of part one, now ResA, and the end of the exile’s lament of part two, now ResB. Further, the point of folio loss was exactly at the point in the texts identified by previous critics to show the change in tone of the speaker. In identifying two individual poems, Frantzen/Bliss provided an explanation for

---

50 The poem is still included in modern genre studies of Old English elegies, e.g. Klinck (1992).
the duality of the speaker. In re-evaluating previous scholarship, they showed that although older criticism facilitated the reconciliation of some of these differences, it failed to provide a satisfactory answer to all. Their article explained how folios were wont to become detached during the history of a manuscript, whether as a result of loss due to wear and tear typical of outer leaves of gatherings, loss of folios from being purposely cut out of the manuscript, leaving tell-tale stubs along the gutter, or from the fold in a large double sheet being worn through, one side falling loose and becoming lost, and the remainder eventually being pasted back into place in the manuscript. This last instance is what accounts for the loss of a folio between ResA and ResB, which, by their reasoning, would have contained the close of ResA and the beginning of ResB.  

An examination of the Exeter Book and its gatherings, undertaken in person in July 2007, confirms the Frantzen/Bliss theory of folio loss between ff.118r-19v: there is no stub indicating the folio was cut out, but rather the remaining half of the double sheet has been pasted back into place in the manuscript. The following diagram replicates gatherings XV and XVI, where the dotted line corresponds to the lost folio:

Gatherings XV and XVI of the Exeter Book (from Frantzen/Bliss, 1976: 388)

As Frantzen/Bliss show, the arrangement of these gatherings corresponds closely to other gatherings in the Exeter Book, namely II and VI; this indicates that the type of folio loss between ResA and ResB is not uncommon within the manuscript. Their discovery therefore highlights the

---

51 See discussion of Klinck’s (1992) objections to this theory below (p. 18ff.)
importance of re-evaluating the integrity of Old English texts, as the impact of folio loss can be significant.

Subsequently, the Frantzen/Bliss finding has affected editorial practice of ResA and ResB. Pre-1976 editions of the poems edit the texts at this point as one might expect, placing the final word of ResA, *mid*, at the end of l. 69b and treating the remaining text (ResB) as continuous:

No ðæs earninga ænige wæron *mid*
hwæþre ic me ealles  þæs  ellen wylle
hæbben ond hlyhhan  ond me hyhtan to
frætwian mec on ferðweg  ond fundian
sylf to þam siþe  

(ll. 69-73a, emphasis mine)

However, Frantzen/Bliss argue that this practice is indefensible:

[This] makes neither good sense nor good metre. It seems certain that a new clause begins with *No ðæs earninga*; but, if it does, there is no way of making sense of *mid*. If it is a preposition there is nothing for this to govern, since the only noun, *earninga*, must be the subject of *wæron*. It cannot be an adverb, since *mid* as an adverb always means ‘with him, with it, with them etc.’, and no such meaning will suit the context. Even the meaning ‘in addition’ which could be defended in some of the contexts in which *mid* adverb occurs, will not do here (1976: 389).

They conclude that *mid* (l. 69b) must be the first word of a new line (now l. 70), the rest of which now lost, and as such the text should be edited thus:

ResA:  No ðæs earninga ænige wæron *mid [***]  
        (ll. 69-70)

ResB:  [***]  
         hwæþre ic me ealles  þæs  ellen wylle
         hæbben ond hlyhhan  ond me hyhtan to
         frætwian mec on ferðweg  ond fundian
         sylf to þam siþe  
         (ll. 1-4a)

Frantzen/Bliss thereby demonstrated that ResA and ResB contain a syntactic discontinuity that aligns with folio loss at this point, and that all existing scholarship required reconsideration; a
corresponding surge in critical attention followed the publication of their findings, and the majority of modern scholars now accept their conclusions.⁵² ResA and ResB are now edited and analysed in the main as two distinct works. As Frantzen/Bliss succinctly state, ‘the evidence against the integrity of Res [sic]⁵³ is overwhelming […] The value [of ResA and ResB] as parallels to other Old English poems will consequently have to be reassessed’ (1976: 395).

2.4.3 ResA and ResB in Modern Scholarship

Though ResA and ResB are now accepted as two individual, but thematically linked poems (see, for example, Pope (1978); Lochrie (1986); Pulsiano (1995); Deskis (1998); Muir (2000); Gretsch (2008)), a school of thought remains that prefers to analyse them as a single, if incomplete, poetic unit. This criticism reflects a belief that Frantzen/Bliss do not provide absolute evidence of two separate texts and that any disjunction in tone of the speaker can be explained through an interpretive approach similar to Stanley’s (1955, detailed above, p.47ff). The two key scholars involved in this movement are Nelson (1983) and Klinck (1987; 1992); the latter has produced a genre study of the so-called Exeter Book elegies (1992), which has received mixed critical reception.⁵⁴

Klinck and Nelson argue that the thematic shift between ResA and ResB is not as sudden as the Frantzen/Bliss theory suggests, and that older scholarship (namely Shücking (1919), Prins (1964) and Stanley (1955)) demonstrates the shift from prayer mode to narrative mode is more gradual and therefore more persuasive.⁵⁵ Klinck and Nelson object to the codicological evidence on a number of grounds, arguing that there is no folio loss at all at f.118 and that there is no physical

---

⁵³ Res is the title used by Frantzen/Bliss in their article, prior to their theory being explained. Afterwards, they use the titles ResA and ResB respectively.
⁵⁴ For reviews of Klinck’s genre study see Donohue (1994), who reviews positively in the main and argues that Klinck is acutely aware of the issues involved in ‘genre’; Earl (1994) and Williams (1995) inter alia are more critical of Klinck’s approach.
⁵⁵ Klinck argues that a return to prayer mode occurs at ll. 108b-11a and formulaic introductions characteristic of narrative mode occur at ll. 83b, 89b and 96b (1992: 56); Shücking includes the poem only from 78b onwards in his anthology while Prins believes that the poem at l. 84 does not properly belong with that which preceded it.
evidence of this loss in the manuscript\textsuperscript{56} or that gathering XV of the Exeter Book originally began with a single sheet. Though Nelson admits Frantzen/Bliss’ theory to be convincing, she argues that,

we can allow the poem to retain the integrity it has in Krapp and Dobbie. The missing half leaf need not have been, as Bliss and Frantzen believe, the end of one poem and the beginning of another [...] a determined effort to see [ResA and ResB] whole will show that it is an elegy. (1983: 133, emphasis mine)\textsuperscript{57}

However, if one wishes to assume that there is but one speaker throughout ResA and ResB, several discrepancies must be reconciled:

the sinner first praises God’s goodness and mercy (up to l. 68), but then he laments his wrath (l. 76b-78a). He acknowledges his sinfulness (up to l. 65a), but then complains that he is punished for sins that he cannot understand (l. 77-78a). He places his trust in God (l. 77b) and then in himself (l. 71b). Having declared that he will seek the remedy for his sins, and that he will strive to please God (ll. 20b-21, 29-31a), he protests that he cannot alter his circumstances (l. 103b-1130). (Frantzen/Bliss 1976: 394)

Nelson argues ResA and ResB present a combination of a commendatio animae and a voyage of the soul after death and, further, that a single purpose can be seen within both texts: to prepare the mind and soul for death. Her article contends that ‘both the prayer of part one and the consideration of exile in part two show a conflict between faith and fear’ (1983: 134) and that it is this conflict which links the two parts together to produce this single purpose. Klinck (1992) agrees with Nelson, and follows Krapp/Dobbie (1936) in believing that the journey of ResB is to be understood symbolically: ‘the poem deals not with an actual exile from worldly prosperity, but with spiritual dejection, and the mention of the sea journey [...] is evidently to be taken symbolically’ (Krapp/Dobbie (1936: lx), cited in Klinck (1992: 55)). Further, Klinck argues that Stanley’s (1955) interpretation of the journey of ResB as an actual exile is inconsistent; rather, if

\textsuperscript{56} Klinck (1992: 29) posits that had there been folio loss, physical evidence of its removal, such as ‘the imprint of a knife along the following folio or a sudden increase in burn damage which affects the last part of the manuscript’ would be immediately obvious. However, in their article, Frantzen/Bliss (1979) suggest the folio was in fact lost by the parchment wearing thin at the fold either through the quality of the parchment, overuse or both, which led to the folio working loose and being lost from the manuscript. If their theory is to be believed, this method of folio loss would leave no physical evidence of the kind Klinck suggests is required (see above, p. 7ff).

\textsuperscript{57} However, as Gretsch points out, neither Nelson nor Klinck has any suggestion as to what subject matter the poet could have filled one whole folio of the Exeter Book at this point (Gretsch 2008: 105).
one understands the voyage both symbolically as the death journey, and literally as a voyage from exile, then ResB is brought into line with ResA, where the speaker’s poverty and loneliness are the natural consequences of his exile plight (Klinck: 1987 and 1992). Ultimately, both Nelson and Klinck believe that ResA and ResB benefit from being interpreted as a unified whole; while both theories go some way to explain the purpose of both texts as a unit, they carry with them certain limitations.

More recent scholarship has tended to deal with the poems individually as the manuscript, syntactic and thematic evidence suggests: Lochrie (1986c) deals specifically with spiritual despair in ResB; Pulsiano (1995) and Deskis (1998) do the same; while Gretsch (2008) explores the context for ResA. Only Bestul (1977) continues to treat ResA and ResB as a unified whole without any reference to the Frantzen/Bliss evidence; according to Muir (2000: 671) he had no knowledge of their work at the time of publication. While each new study of the poems is important in advancing an understanding of the texts on an individual basis, the new trend is to separate these texts from one another entirely, with especial focus on ResB as distinct from ResA; in the words of Frantzen/Bliss: ‘freed from its spurious association with the second-rate piety of Resignation A, Resignation B emerges as something quite unlike anything else in Old English’ (1976: 397).

The issue emerging from modern criticism is that these two texts are now analysed by critics who take one of two extreme stances: either reading the texts as one, either before Frantzen/Bliss or in spite of their findings, or analysing them as two individual texts with little or no reference to one another. The result is that recent criticism has neglected to consider what function these texts may serve within their immediate manuscript context. Whether interpreted as one poem or two, ResA and ResB are found together in the Exeter Book, and therefore enjoy a closer manuscript relationship than many of the elegies they were once classified alongside. For example: Wan and Sfr are separated by two poems (Gifts and Prec), Ruin is found 25 poems and 62 Riddles apart from Sfr; only Deor and Wulf and Rid60 and Husb are found together in the manuscript. However, the last pair listed here is often not thought to belong to the elegy genre at

58 See headnote to Contrition A and B, Muir (1994; 2000: 670)
all. Donoghue (1994), in a review of Klinck’s *Elegies* (1992), makes the following important point, which I include in full below:

The compiler of the Exeter Book may well have noticed the similarities of *The Wanderer* and *The Seafarer*, but no more or less than their similarities with the two poems that separate them: *The Gifts of Men* and *Precepts*. The nine poems edited as elegies […] are scattered throughout the second half of the Exeter Book […] If the genre of elegy was a meaningful category to the compiler, he could have grouped at least some of these nine together. […] That he did not gives rise to the question: what justification do we have to extract these poems from the others, pronounce them elegies, adjust our definition of elegies according to the peculiar features of this group, and analyze them according to this retrospectively conceived genre? (Donoghue 1994: 107)

The possible significance of manuscript context cannot, therefore, be ignored. In order to address this evidence, previous classification of the poems as elegies is re-examined and thematic links to other poems in the Exeter Book are analysed. In particular, the themes of exile and spiritual despair previously used to classify the poems in the elegy genre are reconsidered.

2.4.4 ResA and ResB as Elegy

As indicated earlier, the genre of elegy can be a problematic one. Timmer (1942) argues there is no such genre as elegy, though the elegiac mood is widespread. Klinck (1992) in her monograph *The Old English Elegies: A Critical Edition and Genre Study*, defines the genre thus:

[The] Old English elegy is a discourse arising from a powerful sense of absence, of separation from what is desired, expressed through characteristic words and themes, and shaping itself by echo and leitmotiv into a poem that moves from disquiet to some kind of acceptance. (1993: 246)

Her definition complements Stanley Greenfield’s, which Klinck quotes at the beginning of her study:

relatively short reflective or dramatic poem embodying a contrasting pattern of loss and consolation, ostensibly based upon a specified personal experience or observation, and expressing an attitude towards the experience (Klinck 1992: 12, citing Greenfield 1966: 143).
However, despite producing a genre study of the Exeter Book elegies, Klinck has been criticised for openly assuming the existence of a genre (see Klinck 1992: 3) ‘not only in her selection of materials […] but in their treatment as well’ (Williams 1995: 241). Her study includes poems not necessarily always associated with the genre (see discussion above) and, as Williams continues, shows ‘evident contentment with the traditional classification of the nine poems she presents’ (ibid). Though Klinck’s study is evidently aware of the limitations of such an approach (see her discussion of the nature of elegy in Old English, for example, pp. 221-52), the issues raised by this approach are representative of what Donohue describes as ‘the classic example of the way nineteenth- and twentieth-century readers have imposed modern categories of thought on medieval works’ (1994: 107). Though her study examines the issues of genre head-on, Klinck herself admits,

The genre in Old English must have been variable and changing, but I shall present it in static terms, because the chronology of the works is uncertain […] There are no very strong indications that any of the elegies is even particularly close to another in its provenance […] The manuscript distinguishes no elegiac genre as such […] (Klinck 1992: 30)

James Earl therefore criticises Klinck’s identification of this ‘genre’ in his review of her work:

Klinck is quick to admit that no features are shared by all of these poems but argues that they constitute a genre nonetheless. The term ‘elegy’ corresponds to a ‘trans-historical tendency’, such that even the authors of the poems, if they had been aware of each other’s work, might not have recognized the generic relation. […] Given the remarkable range of differences among the nine poems, editing them as a group necessarily results in a mare's nest of partial and overlapping generalizations (Earl 1994: 1197).

In appropriating specific criteria to a genre, and therefore to the texts within that genre, certain texts are liable to suffer. The classification of ResA and ResB alongside the other elegies, therefore, must be approached with caution. When ResA and ResB are removed from the constraints of a supposed ‘genre’ and instead analysed by use of common motifs, namely spiritual despair and spiritual exile, one can come to appreciate the two texts on their own terms. Just as JDayI has suffered by being compared unfavourably to JDayII and ChrIII as part of a presupposed Judgement Day genre, so ResA and ResB have suffered in comparison to Wan and
Sfr as elegies. The following discussion, therefore, includes a brief summary of the supposed links between the four texts (Wan, Sfr, ResA and ResB) leading to a reconsideration of these central themes in ResA and ResB and other poems of the Exeter Book. By momentarily putting to one side the term ‘elegy’ and all its connotations, previous criticisms of the poems are resolved; both poems may then be reconsidered on their own merits.

2.4.4.1 ResA and ResB alongside Wan and Sfr
As discussed earlier in this section, Stanley (1955) was the first to argue for the supposed shared characteristics between Wan, Sfr, ResA and ResB, based around the shared image of exile. The specific contention of Stanley’s article is that,

Factually or figuratively, it is miseries such as these [i.e. exile] that a man must flee to, if he sees no lasting hope in this dead life of worldly joys. For that reason voluntary exile was a penitential discipline in Anglo-Saxon society; and in Anglo-Saxon poetry the most effective way of inducing contempt of the world is to tell ethopoeically of the miseries that are in this world, and how much more gladly and readily they are to be embraced than the false joys of this dead life. (1955: 454)

In relation to ResA and ResB, this is only really true of part two of the text (ResB l. 70ff; l. 1ff) where our speaker is found exiled from God and also seemingly from society; the speaker of part one (ResA ll. 1-70) does not tell of these miseries, only of his own specific misery that he has sinned more often than he should and that God may not grant him absolution. In order to try to account for this difference, Stanley labels ResA and ResB as ‘muddled’ that have the confession of sins at their centre (ll. 25-28). Amidst this confession of sins, Stanley sees the penitent, driven by guilt, seeking another way of life where, in the penitential journey he must make away from the joys of the world, death seems imminent (1955: 461). Stanley believes the value of ResA and ResB can be identified in this combination of confession and exile; that is, the value of ResA and ResB are as an aid to the interpretation of Sfr. He identifies the introduction of the account of the state of exile to start at ResB (l. 9): forþon ic þus bittre wearð gewitnad fore þis se worulde: ‘therefore I have been severely punished in sight of this world’, an account, he argues, is very similar to that given by the seafarer between ll. 39-57. He continues by arguing that the

59 Following the work of Whitelock on Sfr (1950), he explains that the poems are imagined situations ‘invented to give force to the doctrine which forms [the poems’] purpose’ (1955: 453).
following lines of *ResB*: *Ic bi me tylgust secge þis sarespère*: ‘I relate this sad story about myself’ (ll. 26b-27a), where the penitent tells of the miseries of exile, parallel the opening words of *Sfr*: *mæg ic be me sylfum soðgied wrecan*: ‘I tell this true story about myself’. Finally, he argues that the *ResB* penitent’s introduction of the subject of exile for his instruction and example are reminiscent of *Wan* and *Sfr*:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Ne mæg þæs anhoga} \\
&\text{leadwynna leas leng drohtian} \\
&\text{winæas wræcca. Is him wrað meotud} \\
&\text{gornæð on his geoguþ [{***]} } \\
&\text{ond him ælce mæle men fullestað} \\
&\text{ycæð his yrmþu. Ond he þæt eal þolað} \\
&\text{sarcwide secca ond him bið a sefa geomor} \\
&\text{mod morgenseoc.}
\end{align*}
\]

[A recluse without social joy, friendless, he can no longer live in society. The Lord is angry with him, he laments his youth [{****}] and men constantly give him alms, increase his misery. And he endures all that, men’s bitter reproach, and his heart is always full of sorrow, his mind is morning-sick.] (ll. 89b-96a; ll. 19b-26a)

In comparison, the central theme of *Wan* is shown in the following lines:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Ongietan sceal gleaw hæle hu gæstlic bið} \\
&\text{þonne ealre þisse worulde wela weste stondeð}
\end{align*}
\]

[A wise man must realize how terrible it will be, when all the wealth of this world lies waste.] (ll. 73-74)

Just as the poet of *Wan* begins and ends with the hope of God’s grace and mercy, so the speaker of *Wan* starts from and returns to the same. *ResA* and *ResB* on the other hand, begin with God’s grace and mercy (*ResA*), but end with God’s wrathfulness and anger (*ResB*); the poems do not conclude with the same assurances with which *Wan* and *Sfr* end. Despite these differences, in all four texts, *Wan, Sfr, ResA* and *ResB*, the security of heaven and the mutability of the world are contrasted, though to differing extents in each. It is the miseries of exile, as presented in each poem, which man must flee to in order to pay penance for his sins and which links the three ‘elegies’ to one another.
The differences in tone between the distinct speakers of *ResA* and *ResB* are difficult to resolve and in turn, any reading of *ResA* and *ResB* as elegies is affected. Stanley’s identification of three distinct parts in *ResA* and *ResB* (detailed above) aids a reading of them as a unified whole, particularly when interpreting the texts aside the other elegies; however, as shown by Frantzen/Bliss (1976), this reading can only go so far. Stanley identificies the confession of sins to be at the centre of *ResA* and *ResB*, throughout both the prayer of the first speaker and the monologue of the second. However, this is only really true of the first part (*ResA* ll. 1-70), as the second speaker never confesses his sins; to confess is to admit responsibility, and this is never fully realised in the monologue of *ResB*. The speaker of *ResB* refers to sins but although he admits his punishment is well deserved, it is well deserved only in the eyes of the world, not in his own mind: *forþen ic þus bitter wearð/ gewitnad fore þisse worulde swa min gewyrhto wæro: ‘therefore I have been severely punished in sight of this world, as I deserved’ (ll. 79b-80; ll. 9b-10). It seems unlikely that the repentant speaker of the prayer should so suddenly change his outlook to that of the lamenting exile, and that a speaker should go from viewing God as merciful to viewing God as wrathful within ten lines. Though the speaker of *ResB* laments, he does not lament his sins, like the first speaker; he laments his punishments and miseries suffered on earth. Frantzen/Bliss’ analysis of the theme of the poem provides even further evidence against its integrity. As they argue, if we assume the speaker has not changed, any departure from the,

established pattern of self-accusation and dependence on God’s mercy set out in the first sixty-nine lines is somewhat unexpected. If we ignore this change in attitude, it is still difficult to understand why the speaker should claim ignorance of some sins when he has so openly admitted many others. (1976: 393)

In other words, the exile that the speaker of *ResB* suffers, his poverty, hardship and his inability to love his fellow man are the type of trials God might send to test him as he seeks redemption (as the speaker of *ResA* so clearly requests).

The integrity of *ResA* and *ResB* is key here in relation to the classification of the texts as elegies, as the evidence put forward in favour of such a reading, particularly these images of exile, are weakened when *ResA* is separated from *ResB*. Previous work on the theory of pilgrimage and
exile (Whitelock, 1950) adduced by critics such as Stanley (1955) and Henry (1966) to account for the journey imagery in their analysis of ResA and ResB is shown to be problematic. Whitelock argues in her interpretation of Sfr that the voyage into the unknown was a voluntary act undertaken as a means of obtaining eternal life and therefore an act of penance. By applying this theory to ResA and ResB as Stanley and Henry do, we are immediately presented with a number of obstacles: the exile of ResB is described by Stanley as embarking upon a voyage away from the world’s joys, but as Frantzen/Bliss remark, it is difficult to understand what joys these would be. The exile describes none of the joys of his life on earth, and one is left to presume his journey is in fact to escape his worldly miseries rather than a penitential voyage in which he leaves the material pleasures of his life behind in order to secure spiritual pleasures in the next life. As Frantzen/Bliss explain: ‘the journey he contemplates is clearly prompted by his misery and his sinfulness – a connection essential to a ‘penitential motif’ – is suggested only briefly in ll. 76b-82a and even there the link is tenuous […] he neither expresses sorrow for his sins nor asks God to forgive them: his attitude is not penitential’ (1976: 396-97). A further difficulty of this approach presents itself when trying to explain the reason the speaker cannot make his journey – he has no money:

```plaintext
nat min [***]
hwy ic gebyce bat on sæwe
fleot on faroðe; nah ic fela goldes
ne huru þæs freondes þa me gefylste
to þam siðfate.

[My [***] does not know why I may buy a passage on the sea, a ship on the wave; I have little gold, and no friend who may help me on my journey.] (ll. 99-103a; ll. 19-23a)
```

However, neither Stanley nor Henry (1966) provide a solution to this problem; Stanley does not deal with the issue at all, and while Henry notes that the exile’s intentions towards his journey are open to question, he does not explore these intentions further. As a result, ResB does not detail the exile’s journey as Wan and Sfr do, the journey itself is not realised in the course of the text, and the exile does not come to the same conclusions as found in Wan and Sfr. His concluding thoughts are of resignation towards his miserable state; the poem fails to end with a man enlightened by the penitential experience of pilgrimage or exile. Even if ResA and ResB are considered a single poem, Frantzen/Bliss have convincingly shown that the links between Wan
and Sfr themselves are questionable: ‘both poems combine narrative and homiletic material; both contain impressive descriptions of sea voyages: but neither of these characteristics is very uncommon in Old English poetry [and] the differences between them are substantial’ (1976: 401). Their article contends that any link between ResA and ResB (in any of its manifestations) and these poems, or any classification of ResA and ResB as an elegy, is,

   beyond the bounds of plausibility […] once Res is seen, not as a single unified poem, but as a chance collocation of fragments of two […] poems, its relevance to Wan and Sfr becomes remote indeed. (1976: 402)

Once ResB is released from the constraints of being read as the second half of ResA, the poem emerges as ‘something quite unlike anything else in Old English: a dramatic monologue by the type of man who never succeeds in any of his enterprises, and who blames everyone but himself for his failure’ (Frantzen/Bliss 1976: 397). They conclude that ResB is in no sense a religious poem but rather a psychological study of a state of mind. Just as ResA must be separated from ResB, so ResB must be distinguished from the elegies; ‘they do not illuminate it, and it does not illuminate them’ (1976: 402).

2.4.4.2 ResA and ResB: Spiritual Exile

Though the evidence now suggests ResA and ResB do not sit quite as comfortably within the genre of the elegies as was previously believed, the theme of exile so often ascribed to texts of this genre can still be understood to be reasonably central to both poems. Here, however, the theme of exile is specifically a spiritual one where each speaker is experiencing exile from God: the first (ResA) attempts to end his exile through acts of penance and confession, while the second (ResB) demonstrates the hardships of such exile. Spiritual exile can also be seen within JDayI, where the descriptions of man preoccupied with material wealth can be seen as an exile not only from God, but from the spiritual wealth enjoyed by the deep-thinking man (ll. 80ff).

ResA and ResB are found within a group of poems in the Exeter Book that run from Wife to Ruin and which fall between the two groups of Riddles, Rid1-59 and Rid61-94. The importance of this
grouping in relation to this thesis is that the poems JDayI, ResA, ResB, Desc, Alms, Phar, LPrl, and HomFrll can be understood to function as an extended unit comparable to the unit of JDayII to GlorI found in CCCC MS 201; the theme of each poem relates to the Easter season. However, when drawing links between texts based on their manuscript context, one must look back as well as forward. The theme of spiritual exile is in fact present in many of the poems of the Exeter Book – outwith the obvious references to Wan and Sfr outlined above – and the image of suffering distance or separation can be seen to be reintroduced after the first set of Riddles by Wife. What follows is a discussion which contextualises the use of this theme in ResA and ResB to that of the Exeter Book more generally. Additionally, an examination of the theme within the group of poems which includes JDayI, ResA and ResB aids a reading of ResA and ResB as individual texts linked by theme, and bring together the opposing views of post-Frantzen/Bliss criticism detailed previously in this section.

2.4.5 Uhtcearu and mod morgenseoc: Spiritual Despair in the Exeter Book

Of particular interest with regards to the theme of spiritual exile in ResA and ResB is the use of terms for spiritual despair and sickness of the soul or mind, which relate specifically to the morning. Stanley, the first to make the link between despair and time of day, observes: ‘[I]t appears with the Anglo-Saxons morning was a special time of misery […] a time of terror without solace’ (1955: 434-35). The evidence for spiritual despair in the morning is important here, as most of the references to it appear in the Exeter Book: uhtcearu (lit. ‘dawn-sadness’) is found in Wan ll. 8b-9a as uhtna […] ceare and again in Wife l. 7b as uhtceare; similarly, mod morgenseoc (‘morning-sick mind’) is found in ResB l. 26a and a further two references to sickness of the mind may also be found in ResB: modearfoþ (‘distress of mind’ or as defined in BT: ‘travail of the soul’) in l. 17a. Other references to ‘sickness of mind’ more generally include: hygegeomor (‘sad in mind’); geomormod (‘sad of mind’ or as defined in BT: ‘sad-hearted’); and modseoc (‘sick in mind’), again, predominantly from the Exeter Book.\footnote{Further discussion of this can be found below in Section III: Contextual Evidence and Section IV: Manuscript Evidence.} A passage from Beo reveals a

\footnote{hygegeomor: GenAB l. 876; And l. 1085, 155; ChrIII l. 889; GuthB l. 1156; Wife l. 17. geomormod: GenAB l. 1049, 2268; And l. 401, 1398; El l. 411, 555; ChrI l. 172; ChrII l. 533;
similar link between morning and sadness, though this link is implied rather than expressed through specific mod- or –ceare compounds: Symble bið gemyndgad morna gehwylce / eaforan ellorsið: ‘He is continually reminded every morning of the death of his son’\textsuperscript{62} (Beo ll. 2450-51).

In a short article on the subject, Karma Lochrie modifies Stanley’s view (outlined above), by stating that the speaker of ResB is describing his state of mind, rather than the time of day, when he says he is morgenseoc ‘morning-sick’ (l. 26a) and that the use of this phrase within the poem is therefore marked, in comparison to the sickness of mind mod- / -ceariig compounds elsewhere; specifically, the use in ResB suggests it was not just a ‘special time for misery’, as Stanley suggests (1955: 434), but a metaphor for misery itself, a specific type of ‘spiritual nausea’ (Lochrie 1986c: 317-18).

Lochrie is not alone in her analysis of this term in ResB; Pulsiano, in his 1995 article, provides a possible explanation for this specific reference to spiritual nausea at dawn, pointing to Psalm 142: 8 which reads: ‘cause me to hear thy mercy in the morning; for in thee I have hoped’. He explains:

Psalm 142 is typically understood to be spoken by the penitent, who pleads to God for deliverance from tribulation, and as such suggests an initial general correspondence with the narrative of Resignation B. (Pulsiano 1995: 156)

Pulsiano provides evidence that morning is designated as a time of penitence, in which the mind is illuminated with the dawn; further, it is a period linked to the resurrection where morning is referred to as the time after the end of the world when man’s fate is revealed to him (see Peter 1: 19, quoted by Augustine).\textsuperscript{63} He concludes that in comparison to the speaker of Psalm 142 who has a full understanding of the significance of dawn, the speaker of ResB has a morning-sick

\textsuperscript{62} Translation taken from a discussion of the topic by Lochrie (1986c: 316).

\textsuperscript{63} Aurelii Augustini, \textit{Opera}, \textit{Pars X, 3: Enarrationes in Psalmos} CI-CL. Ed. D. Eligius Dekkers and John Fraipont. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 40. Turnholt: Brepols. (1956: 2069). Cited in Pulsiano 1995: 156: ‘We thus have, as Peter says, a more certain prophetic word […] as to a light that shines in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day-star arise in your hearts. Morning he then calls the time after the end of the world, when we will see what in the world we believe’.
mind which can be interpreted as suffering from spiritual despair. This kind of spiritual despair, or spiritual exile, can be seen in both ResA and ResB. Where the speaker of ResA has suffered distance from God because of his sins, he is seeking to undergo penance and offers confession so that he might receive spiritual reconciliation. The speaker of ResB demonstrates the suffering involved in being exiled from God, and reminds the audience that the remedy for such spiritual distance lies with the individual. The ResB speaker, as discussed previously, places responsibility for any reconciliation or salvation entirely with God; the audience is therefore prompted to recognise his actions as misguided, and therefore actively engage in reflective practice, identifying the actions they must take in order to remedy any of their own transgressions. Further, this image of (spiritual) exile and (spiritual) despair allows us to reunite ResA and ResB as two independent but thematically linked works; side by side in the manuscript, they offer a connected meditation on the consequences of sin, eternal and temporal (Noronha 1971: 29).

The use of uhtna [...] ceare in Wife demonstrates the speaker there experiences similar ‘dawn cares’ for her lord. Bearing in mind the links between ResB and Psalm 142 (see: p. 66), I suggest that the references to ‘morning-sickness’ and being ‘sad of mind’ more generally in Wife serve as an introduction of the theme of exile to this group of poems. Equally, Wife emphasises the distance of the speaker from something specific, be it the speaker of Wife to her lord or the ResB speaker to God. As Harbus argues:

In The Wife’s Lament, solitude, exile [...] and misery, all bring about critical mental self-examination [...] Affliction is in the mind, but if circumstances are conductive, so are the means of escape: it is possible to recreate reality by changing thought. (Harbus 2002: 153)

Though I argue in this thesis that the poems from JDayI to HomFrII form a unit within which JDayI, ResA and ResB can be understood as a specific thematic triptych, Wife can be seen to exemplify the overarching themes of this particular poetic group: the theme of exile, the image of longing, or sadness at dawn, as also detailed in ResB and most importantly, the focus on critical

---

Noronha analyses the poems as a unity, his Ph.D. dissertation dating before Frantzen/Bliss’ article. Though his argument analyses the poem as a debate between Christian and pagan (which this present thesis does not uphold), his point, referenced above, is useful here.
mental self-examination. The *JDayI* poet aims to have the audience meditate deeply on the current state of their souls before Judgement; the speaker of *ResA* exemplifies a repentant sinner who has engaged with this self-examination of the soul. *ResB* presents a speaker whose mental self-examination is lacking and who is all too preoccupied with his physical and material sufferings, rather than the spiritual suffering of his soul. In each, the theme of mental self-examination is reimagined to aid the audience on their own penitential journey.

2.4 The Penitential Journey Motif of *ResB*

To further contextualise the penitential journey, or spiritual distance suffered by the *ResB* speaker, an interesting argument by Susan Deskis (1998) provides a possible analogue. In her article ‘Jonah and Genre in Resignation B’ Deskis builds on an argument by Shücking (1919) and suggests the poet of *ResB* references the narrative of the biblical story of Jonah in his imagery of a journey and an exile.\(^{65}\) She writes:

The first clue leading from the speaker of *Resignation B* to the prophet Jonah is repeated emphasis on God’s anger [...] The anger of God combines with the speaker’s own guilt to cause his misery:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Gode ic hæbbe} \\
\text{abolgen brego moncyynes; forþon ic þus bitter weard} \\
\text{gewitnad for þisse worulde, swa min gewyrhto wæron} \\
micle fore monnum, þæt ic martirdom \\
deopne adreoge
\end{align*}
\]

\([I \text{ have enraged God, the ruler of mankind; therefore I am so bitterly punished before the world as my sins were great before men, so that I suffer deep distress.}] (ResB II. 9b-13a)\(^{66}\)

We may interpret these lines as spoken by Jonah, who angered God by his attempt to evade a mission to the Ninevites; whose sin was known to others ([...] the sailors) and who suffered on account of it (his sojourn within the whale). As in the Book of Ionas, the central image of *Resignation B* is that of a voyage, one that the traveller approaches with mixed emotions [...] the speaker of *Resignation B* is preparing himself for a journey he

\(^{65}\) Deskis’ article takes forward an argument by Shücking (1919) who suggested *ResB* could be fully understood as the lament of a specific character from a recognised narrative. Deskis offers such a narrative in her article: the biblical story of Jonah. In particular, she argues the poet was familiar with the Jonah story, and uses the period of Jonah’s journey after he has been released from the whale, and before he returns home from Nineveh.

\(^{66}\) Translation here is as published in Deskis article. See Manuscript Notes for the original manuscript reading *mart[**]*dom which is obscured by fire damage.
does not relish, but has been ordered by God to undertake; in this he resembles Jonah before his trip to Nineveh. (Deskis 1998: 189-91)

Further, Deskis focuses on the difficult relationship the speaker has with other people, identifying him as a ‘prototypical exile (*anhoga* (l. 20b); *wraecca* (l. 22a))’ (Deskis 1998: 191). In this respect, she again links the poem to Jonah: the kindness offered to Jonah by the sailors serves only to increase his misery as they take him towards Nineveh, where he does not wish to be and which ultimately result in him being thrown overboard and swallowed by the whale. Deskis parallels this point in the story of Jonah with *ResB* ll. 24-26a:

\[
\text{ond him ælce mæle} \quad \text{men fullestað} \\
yeað his yrmbu. \quad \text{Ond he þæt eal þolað,} \\
sarewide secga.
\]

>[and each season men give him alms, increase his misery. And he endures all that, men’s bitter reproach.]

and further ll. 35-37:

\[
\text{þonne ic me to fremþum} \quad \text{freode hæfde,} \\
cyðþu gecweme \quad \text{me was a cearu symle} \\
lufena to leana, \quad \text{swa ic alifde nu.}
\]

>[When I had friendship from strangers, pleasant neighbours, sorrow was always mine as reward for love, as I have now conceded.]

Finally, she focuses her attention on the debated phrase *nat min [...] / hwic gebycge bat on sæwe*: ‘my [...] does not know with what I may buy a passage on the sea’ (ll. 20-21). Cross (1974) and Malmberg (1979) after him argue the phrase translates as ‘buy a passage’ rather than ‘buy a boat’; Cross finds a connection between the phrase here, and that found in *VercHomXIX* which recounts the story of Jonah:

\[
\text{He þeah on fleame wæs oð to sæ becwom [ond] him þær scip gebohte [ond] mid þam scipmannum him þohte ofer sæ to seglgenne.}^{69}
\]

---

[He fled until he came to the sea, and there bought himself (passage on) a ship, and he intended to sail over the sea with those sailors.]^{70}

Deskis pursues Cross’s link further, arguing,

Our Resignation B Jonah, then, stands on the shore near Ninevah, away from his home (‘ic afysed eom / earm of minum eþle’, 19b-20a) and left without money or friends (‘nah ice fela godes / ne huru þæs freondes’, 32b-33a); he is worried about the task God has assigned him, but unable to evade it by purchasing a passage home. (Deskis 1998: 193)^{71}

The biblical story of Jonah is entirely penitential; in the VercHomXIX version of the Jonah story, the homilist describes the origin of sin and man’s sinful nature and makes a plea for moral conversion. As Szarmach states in his article on the versions of the Jonah story, ‘the repentance that Rogationtide demands of us is thus set in a universal perspective’ where the homilist details that

those faithfully and religiously observing these three days [of Rogation] will protect themselves before God, gaining his forgiveness despite the number of sins they have committed. The story of Jonah is then introduced as a biblical precedent showing a change of heart towards God during Rogationtide will result in divine forgiveness. After his account of this biblical tale the homilist gives the corresponding historical precedent of Mamertus of Vien and closes with a further exhortation to choose ‘the better’. (Szarmach 1972: 185)

The quotation from Szarmach on Jonah as expressed in VercHomXIX also serves to explain the final lines of ResB:

\[
\text{Giet bǐ þæt selast, } \quad \text{þonne mon him sylf ne mæg}
\]
\[
\text{wyrd onwendan,} \quad \text{þæt he þonne wel þolige.}
\]

[Yet it is best that, when a man cannot change his fate himself, that he endure it well.] (ResB ll. 47-48)

In other words, enduring one’s fate on earth and changing one’s attitude to God will result in the divine forgiveness expressed by the Vercelli homilist above. It is necessary for Jonah, just as it is

\[^{70}\text{Translation from Deskis (1998: 193)}\]
\[^{71}\text{‘The speaker of Resignation B corresponds to the prophet Jonah in a number of particulars: they have both suffered the wrath of God; their sin is made public and they are punished for it by God; made reluctant by fear, they must undertake a compelled journey; they have a mixed experience with friendly strangers; and they are concerned with booking a passage on a ship’ (Deskis 1998: 195).}\]
necessary for the speaker of ResB, to endure his sufferings well on earth in order to win accord between himself and God, accept his sins are to blame and so gain salvation: the journey is therefore penitential.

2.5 ResA and ResB: Conclusion

The most influential argument to link ResA and ResB to penitential poetry is Stanley (1955); much of Stanley’s evidence comes from ResA (ll. 1-70a). However, Deskis’ evidence for a Jonah link to ResB strengthens two correspondences made by Stanley between ResB and penitential poetry – references to God’s anger and the speaker’s reference to a journey – through her links to Jonah as the speaker of the poem.72 As Deskis and Szarmach before her detail, the Jonah story appears in three homilies composed for the feast of Rogationtide (including VercHomXIX), which centered on the necessity of repentance and penance.73 Though the speaker of ResB has been previously labelled the ‘anti-type of the true penitent’ (Pulsiano 1995: 155) his actions in the poem can be understood as inspiring penance among the audience; as detailed above, the audience would identify with the speaker’s wrongdoing, and thereby reflect on the correct method of penance necessary. Though the actions of the ResB speaker may not immediately lend themselves to a penitential character, the act of reading about them aids the audience in the act of penance. As Frantzen/Bliss point out, ResB offers ‘a psychological study of a state of mind’ (1976: 402). This study inspires the mental self-examination detailed by Harbus (2002) that is characteristic of the aim of the JDayI poet, and exemplified by the ResA speaker. Though ResA and ResB can be understood as sharing characteristics typical of other ‘elegies’, the way these characteristics are realised differs; I propose that these texts benefit more by being read in their immediate manuscript context.

73 Ælfric’s version of the Jonah story includes a preface that explicitly links the biblical tale of Jonah to the feast of Rogation (see Clemoes’ edition 1997: 1, 244-47, Godden’s commentary 2000: 145-53, and also Szarmach 1972: 188).
2.6 Section II: Conclusion

The characteristics that may have inspired these poems’ original composition therefore did not inspire their manuscript compilation. If it had, *Wan, Sfr, Rim, Deor, Wulf, Ruin, Wife, ResA* and *ResB, Rid60* and *Husb*\(^74\) might appear together in the manuscript, their elegiac characteristics having appealed to the compiler. What we have in the present manuscript is something quite else, and the link between *ResB* and the homilies on Jonah, as detailed by Deskis, reveals further possibilities about the poem’s function, its place in the Exeter Book, and the relationship with *JDayI* especially, but also to the poems that follow it: *Desc, Alms, Phar, LPrI, and HomFrII*. An examination of the importance of manuscript context is therefore necessary.

To this end, Section III provides an analysis of the thematic links between *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB*, along with evidence of similar manuscript compilation in other Old English manuscripts. It examines links to homilies collected together for use during Rogationtide, here argued to have inspired the compilation of our three poems, and analyses the importance of manuscript information, namely textual division practice, in providing physical evidence which supports a reading of these three poems as a conceptual unit.

\(^74\) I include here the full list of poems previously interpreted as ‘elegies’, including *Husb* and *Rid60* which do not always form part of that genre.
Section III

Contextual Evidence

3.1 A Conceptual Unit in the Exeter Book

This Section brings together the thematic evidence of Section II to argue that \textsl{JDayI}, \textsl{ResA} and \textsl{ResB} were placed together in the Exeter Book by the manuscript compiler to be read as a unit. It is further argued that this manuscript compilation was thereby designed to inspire compunction and encourage reflective practice and mental self-examination among its audience. As discussed previously, \textsl{JDayI}, \textsl{ResA} and \textsl{ResB} have differed greatly in their previous critical reception; however, many of the issues raised in this scholarship can be further illuminated or resolved by reading the three texts together. Though I do not argue these texts were composed at the same time, or by the same author, I do argue that much can be gained from reading the three as a unit in their manuscript context.

In particular, Section IV argues that these texts form a thematic triptych which helps focus the audience on themes relating to preparation of the soul and builds on previous scholarship which relates texts at this point in the manuscript to the Easter season; specifically, it provides evidence that they may have been inspired by homilies designed for use during Rogationtide, rather than at Easter, and further, that they can be understood as part of a wider group within the Exeter Book. Finally, it shows that similar textual groupings can be seen in other manuscripts. Together, this evidence is therefore indicative of a wider textual tradition and meditative practice.

3.1.1 \textsl{JDayI}, \textsl{ResA} and \textsl{ResB}: Identifying a Conceptual Unit

Though the structure and form of the three poems are certainly very different – an exhortation, a prayer and a narrative – the central message to meditate upon one’s fate and prepare for the coming Judgement via penance is common to all. While \textsl{JDayI} is less concerned with listing the
events of the last Judgement than its $JDayII$ and $ChrIII$ counterparts,\textsuperscript{75} its purpose is to exhort the audience to meditate immediately upon their sinful state for the time of Judgement is imminent. $ResA$ can be understood to be a prayer of perseverance, in which the speaker accepts the hardships of his life as penitential trials sent by God, while $ResB$ is a narrative in which the speaker only grudgingly acknowledges responsibility for his sins. His sufferings are those which he endures, not for any higher merit or penitential purpose, but because they cannot be prevented. In effect, each of these poems present variation on the themes of penance and meditation where the lessons of $JDayI$ are further extemporised by specific, individual speakers in $ResA$ and $B$, encouraging the audience to relate these lessons to their own practice.

Though the texts can be linked via a shared thematic concern, they can also be seen to work together in a number of specific textual ways. First, $JDayI$ is essentially a homiletic poem written in the third person with little reference to a personalized speaker.\textsuperscript{76} However, the close of $JDayI$ presents a change in tone to a prayer-like, first-person narrative mode in which the speaker asks for the audience’s participation, embarking on a prayer that seeks a response in the form of a confession of sins and a plea to be saved at the last Judgement. This is, in effect, what $ResA$ offers: after making a plea to God for help, the speaker prays for his words, deeds, thoughts and body and asks God for forgiveness. Therefore, the placement of $ResA$ after $JDayI$, either by the scribe or manuscript compiler, may have been inspired by the instructions and warnings of $JDayI$.

Further, though the folio containing the close of $ResA$ and the opening of $ResB$ is now lost,\textsuperscript{77} it is still possible to discern evidence of thematic unity between $ResA$ and $ResB$ and between both these texts and $JDayI$. The final lines of $ResB$ can be closely linked to the close of $JDayI$ in which the lesson of both is the same: man cannot change his fate at the last Judgement, but he must think well in order to endure it:

\textsuperscript{75} See Section II: Context, above.
\textsuperscript{76} See: Lochrie, 1986: 324.
\textsuperscript{77} See Section II: Context, above.
Oncweþ nu þisne cwide cuþ sceal geweorþan ðæt ic gewægan ne mæg wyrd under heofonum ac hit þus gelimpan sceal leoda gehwylcum ofer eall beorht gesetu byrnende lig. Siþþan æfter þam lige lif bið gestapelad welan ah in wuldre se nu wel þenceð.

[Now repeat this saying: it must be clearly known that I cannot prevent that fate under the heavens, but it shall happen to everyone, burning flame upon all their bright habitation. Then after that flame life is established; happiness in glory will be given to him who now meditates well.] (JDayI ll.114-9)

Giet biþ þæt selast þonne mon him sylf ne mæg wyrd onwendan þæt he þonne wel þolige.

[Yet it is best that, when a man cannot change his fate himself, that he endure it well.] (ResB ll.117-18)

As Lochrie explains, ‘the distinct repetition in these gnomic conclusions suggests a kind of thematic envelope pattern for these three poems’ (1986b: 327), in which the didactic aims of the first are echoed in the last, prompting the reader to reflect on his own fate and thereby enter into the practice of meditation which forms the focus of the JDayI poet’s exhortation.

Additionally, JDayI presents three distinct types of man: the first two are descriptions of the unwise man, who does not think on his future for he is all consumed with the delights of the present. The third typifies the model of the deep-thinking soul, who does indeed meditate now upon his sins and thinks well upon his future. These two general types described in JDayI fit those expressed within ResA and ResB; ResA presents the well-thinking man described at the close of JDayI while ResB describes the unwise man, and brings the three poems full circle, further reinforcing the message to meditate immediately on one’s sinful state – in effect, repeating the exhortation we find at the close of JDayI.
3.2 Similar Thematic Readings in other Texts
Though striking in its structure, the focus of this conceptual unit is not unique; a similar treatment of this material can be seen in other poems within the Exeter Book and elsewhere in the corpus of Old English poetry; for example, the journey of the exile in both Wan and Sfr; eschatological elements within Dream, ChrIII, JDayII; sorrow at dawn, indicating spiritual despair or exile of some kind (religious (from God) or secular (one’s lord)) in Desc and Wife; the focus on or reference to wyrd throughout the corpus; the detail of the soul’s relationship to the body in SoulI and SoulII. In particular, this latter example provides a specific and interesting similarity in material between JDayI, ResA and ResB and that contained within the Soul and Body debate poems found earlier in the Exeter Book (SoulII ff.98r-100r) and SoulI in the Vercelli Book. Both Soul and Body poems also focus specifically on the fate of the soul but present this theme within the structure of a debate; SoulI contains both the address of the body to the damned and holy soul, while SoulII contains only the damned. In these texts, the damned soul lays out the importance of being mindful of the soul’s need during life to save both body and soul from torment in the afterlife; it also details the horrors of death before the hour of Judgement that both body and damned soul currently have to endure. JDayI, ResA and ResB contribute to this material by providing individual profiles of man. These profiles reflect the damned and holy souls, their reaction to their coming Judgement and their subsequent awareness of their souls’ needs (or lack thereof). In each text, the intention is the same: to promote spiritual reflection during life and repentance where necessary, before Judgement day.

JDayI, ResA and ResB therefore enter into a dialogue of the soul similar to that found in SoulI and SoulII, where the damned and holy soul argues that the responsibility for one’s sins lies with the body (man). Although JDayI, ResA and ResB do not display any specific debate between body and soul per se, the themes expressed within these texts mirror the sentiments of these other Soul/Body poems. This helps to place the texts within a wider context of Old English poetry that presents the themes of holy and damned souls, or wise or little-thinking man in opposition to one another, for a rhetorical purpose. In many ways, the aim of JDayI, ResA and ResB is to inspire spiritual reflection on the needs of one’s soul; if this practice is carried out satisfactorily, the audience will have prepared their souls for the coming Judgement, thus saving
themselves from the horrors detailed by the damned soul in SoulI and SoulII earlier in the Exeter Book. In each of these texts the repeated lesson is to be mindful of one’s deeds before Judgement to ensure salvation and avoid damnation. Both JDayI and ResB close with this sentiment, while it is also echoed in the opening lines of SoulI from the Vercelli Book and SoulII from the Exeter Book:

Huru, ðæs behoфаð hæleða æghwylc
þæt he his sawle sið sylfa geþence
hu ðæt bið deoplic þonne se deað cymeð asyndreð þa sybbe þe ær samod wæron lic ond sawle. (SoulII ll.1-5a)

Huru, ðæs behoфаþ hæleþa æghwylc
þæt he his sawle sið sylfa bewitige
hu ðæt bið deoplic þonne se deað cymeð asun德拉ð þa sibbe, þa þe ær somud wæron lic ond sawle. (SoulII ll.1-5a)

[Certainly it is necessary for every man to consider for himself the journey his soul will have to make, how terrible it will be when death comes, and separates the kinsmen who once were joined: the soul and the body]  

Here, the message is placed in the context of the separation of the soul and body at Judgement; this separation is also emphasised by the JDayI poet where he states that the soul and body must part at death and then rejoin at the hour of Judgement in order that they be judged together:

Folc biþ gebonnen,
Adames bearn ealle to spræce;
beoð þonne gegæadrad gæst ond bansele,
gesomnad to þam siþe.

[The people, children of Adam, will be all summoned to plead. Body and soul will then be assembled, united for the journey.] (JDayI ll100b-103a)

---

78 Translation taken from Shippey (1976).
79 For discussion of the concept of the soul, as it relates to the mind, see Godden (1985); for discussion of the soul as it relates to the body see (inter alia): Davis (2008); Frantzen (1982); Orton (1979a and 1979b); Ackerman (1962); Bossy (1976); Ryting (2000); Raskolnikov (2001); Robertson (2006, 2009, forthcoming 2012). For a summary of Ælfric’s approach to the journey of the soul between death and Judgement, see Grundy (1991: 213-242). Jones (1999) provides a fascinating discussion on the changing explanations of physical resurrection, particularly in relation to the phoenix myth and the bestiaries.
In this way, *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB* can be seen as analogous to *SoulI* and *SoulII* as they use the same material, and present the same didactic aim; in *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB*, it has been argued that the poems use this material to help the reader prepare specifically for Easter season (Muir 2000 and Anderson 1986), and both the celebration of the resurrection and, later, the Ascension of Christ. Easter is especially important in the context of Judgement Day as it is often related in theology to the perceived time of the Parousia and of Judgement day itself. Therefore, a selection of meditative texts within the Exeter Book would function as an aid to contemplation for use during the Easter season, but also the related significance of this time of year for the personal spiritual reflection and development of members of the audience.

This concept of individual reflection is dealt with elsewhere within the Exeter Book, especially in the elegiac poems such as *Wan* and *Sfr* (discussed previously). Though I do not argue here that they provide parallels to *JDayI* or *ResA* and *ResB*, they do provide the reader with the necessary context of a spiritual journey to which the conceptual unit of *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB* contribute. Each text in the manuscript helps build upon the audience’s knowledge and awareness of the importance of spiritual contemplation. In this respect, *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB* could be read either as a thematic unit in their own right, or along with the following texts in the manuscript which include *Desc*, *Alms*, *Phar*, *LPrl*, *HomFrII*. As this section will show, either practice would enable spiritual contemplation and form part of the audience’s personal preparations for the Easter season and beyond, specifically, leading up to the Feast of the Ascension.

3.3 A Wider Thematic Group in the Exeter Book

Links between texts at this point in the manuscript have not gone unnoticed before: Muir (2000; 2006) observes that the arrangement of texts running from *JDayI* to *HomFrII* share common themes relating to the Easter season; Whitbread (1948) also notices a link at this point in the manuscript though he cuts this group one poem shorter than Muir, at f.122 and finishes with the

---

80 The connection between the cross, Christ and the Crucifixion, all images used throughout *JDayI*, *JDayyII*, *ChrII*, *ChrIII*, *Dream* link the Crucifixion to Doomsday, where the cross is a substitute for Christ. Equally, *Blickling Homily Dominica Pascha* specifies that Doomsday will occur at Easter because this season betokens eternal life (Morris, 1967: 83).
Anderson (1986) argues the poems from *Wife to Ruin* constitute an elaborate literary ‘Easter Riddle’ (which he subtitles: ‘Journey from Exile to Glory’) with the specific function of a ‘riddlic rejoinder’ (1986: 99) between the two sets of Riddles in the manuscript. Lochrie (1986b) draws a link between *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB* in particular centring around what she terms the ‘common concern’ with wyrd and its effect of mankind; in so doing she views the three poems as a ‘thematic triplex on the inability of the individual to comprehend the function of fate in their daily lives, and the human endeavour to live meaningfully in the face of that comprehension’ (1986b: 324). The relationship between the texts extends further than Lochrie suggests; manuscript evidence indicates their placement together may not have been purely coincidental, but rather brought together and designed to be a collection of poetic pieces which formed a specific function for the reader as they prepared, as it has been argued, for Easter.

**JDayI, ResA** and **ResB** can therefore be understood to have a dual purpose: to function as a specific unit in their own right, or to form part of a wider group of devotional texts in the Exeter Book. Within this wider group, the conceptual unit of **JDayI, ResA** and **ResB** act as the main devotional texts used to inspire meditation and reflection, while the following poems of *Desc, Alms, Phar, LPrI, HomFrII* provide texts which either focus the audience further upon themes realing to Easter, such as the sacrament of baptism (*Desc*) or provide shorter pieces which bring the meditative act to its conclusion via a series of prayers, such as *Alms, Phar, LPrI, HomFrII*. Just as the central focus of the **JDayI, ResA** and **ResB** unit is not especially unique to those poems the arrangement of a poem referring to Judgement Day followed by a number of prayers and reflective texts is not unique to the Exeter Book.

---

81 While Anderson’s theory deals with any of the same texts as I do here, it should be noted that I do not replicate his arguments that these texts constitute a ‘riddlic rejoining’ bridging the Riddles of Group 3 and 5 to one another. Anderson also argues that *Soul, Deor* and *Wulf* constitute another literary riddle in the manuscript. I find his argument to be rather too far-fetched to stand here, though his identification of shared themes common to Easter is, as described above, recognised by myself and others before me. To this end, I reference his evidence for a thematic unit at this point in the manuscript, but do not agree with his theory these texts are literary riddles.

82 See Section II: Thematic Evidence for a discussion of Lochrie’s argument regarding the structure of **JDayI** and the enfolding thematic sequence with **ResA** and **ResB**. She argues that the three texts are joined by a common concern with wyrd. The present argument is that the thematic connection goes further than this and that the palaeographical manuscript evidence supports such a reading, a research question Lochrie fails to address.

83 This manuscript evidence is presented in full in Section IV: Manuscript Evidence of this thesis.

84 As noted previously, it has been recently argued in a PhD thesis on *Desc* that the poem is less concerned with the descent of Christ into hell as has been previously understood and in fact provides a narrative relating to the life of John the Baptist. See Rambaran-Olm (2012).
3.4 Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 201

It is of significance at this point to discuss a strikingly similar textual arrangement found within Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 201 (CCCC 201), where a poetic unit comprising five texts is headed by a Judgement day poem, *JDayII*, and followed by a series of shorter prayers and penitential texts: *Exhort, Summons, LPrII* and *GlorI*. CCCC 201 is described as a composite volume of three parts, written in various hands, of which ff.161-7 (containing *JDayII, Exhort, Summons, LPrII* and *GlorI*) is one of the older components, written in the eleventh century.\(^85\)

The manuscript contains both Latin and Old English and prose and poetry, including Wulfstan’s Benedictine Office among others;\(^86\) the poems which concern us here (*JDayII – GlorI*) are all predominantly written in the vernacular, though some contain macronic verse which has been argued to link the poems in an envelope pattern (Caie 1994). Also of interest here are the uses of *litterae notabiliores*, which have been argued to denote a textual hierarchy between the texts of the unit. As will be shown in Section IV, these division markers are deployed in a manner similar to practice observed between *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB* in the Exeter Book, where larger, more decorated initials denote the opening of new texts as opposed to subsections. This is discussed in more detail in this section (p. 98ff).

3.4.1 Textual and Manuscript Evidence for a Conceptual Unit in CCCC 201

The opening of *JDayII* is clearly signalled on p.161 of the manuscript, not only by inclusion of rubric: ‘Incipit versus Bede presbyter. De Die Iudicii. Inter florigeras fecundi cespites herbas flamine uentorum resonantibus undique ramis’, but also the use of a large, green *littera notabilior h*, a technique deployed throughout the manuscript to denote the opening of new texts:

\(^85\) The other component of this manuscript datable to the same period is f.1-7 containing a fragment of the Old English *Regularis concordia*, the code of monastic observance. The remainder of the manuscript was written in either the first half or the middle of the eleventh century and contains a number of Wulfstanian sermons; interestingly, this third part of the manuscript was written at Exeter at the time of Bishop Leofric (1050-72). Full manuscript description, dating, provenance and manuscript images can now be accessed via *Parker Library on the Web*: http://parkerweb.stanford.edu/parker/actions/page.do?forward=home [Date of Access: 25.11.11].

\(^86\) This has been argued inspired the compilation of texts in CCCC 201 discussed in this section.
Though the manuscript evidence at the close of *JDayII* clearly indicates the end of a specific section, the scribe continues the text into *Exhort* with little visual clue that it is a brand new work. There is no obvious line spacing to denote a textual division, and the *littera notabilior* is smaller and rendered in red, rather than green, which is usually used to denote a new work:

As Caie (1994: 156) states, ‘it is as if the scribe is pointing out to the reader that at this point the Bede translation [*JDayII*] concludes and an original but related work [*Exhort*] immediately follows’.

---

87 Permission is being sought to reproduce these images in full. See *Parker Library on the Web* for full folio images [http://parkerweb.stanford.edu/parker/actions/page.do?forward=home](http://parkerweb.stanford.edu/parker/actions/page.do?forward=home) [Date of Access: 25.11.11].

88 The poem concludes with a colophon: *her endað þeos boc þe hatte inter florigeras. Ðæt is on englisc betwyx blowende þe to godes rice farað and hu þa prowiað þe to helle farað* (p.165).

89 In CCCC 201, a new work is indicated by means of large green *litterae notabiliores*. This is present at the beginning of *JDayII* but not at the opening of *Exhortation*. There is neither line separation between the texts and no indication of a break between works.
This related work, *Exhort*, functions in this poetic unit in a manner similar to *ResA* in the Exeter Book; it is a text concerned with repentance and the practice of good works as preparation for Judgement, and provides a fitting response to the themes raised in *JDayII* which precedes it. Where *JDayII* has described the ‘blossoming kingdom’ of heaven, *Exhort* offers to teach the audience how to reach it; in a similar manner, *JDayI* calls upon the audience to respond with a penitential prayer, which, as I have argued previously, is exactly what *ResA* provides. The practice in both units, therefore, is remarkably similar.

Following *Exhort*, the third poem of the group, *Summons*, once more opens with no separating line and no green *littera notabilior*, suggesting it is a related work intended to be read with the two preceding poems:

![Image Removed: Available at Parker Library on the Web]

Figure 4: p. 166. Close of *Exhort* and opening red *littera notabilior* P of *Summons* (note: the second P on this folio denotes the opening of *Summons*; the first denotes a final sectional division in *Exhort*)

Indeed, Robinson (1989) convincingly demonstrates that these two texts, *Exhort* and *Summons* are in fact one and the same poem. It has also been previously argued that the macaronic verse of *Summons* further links it to *JDayII* and *Exhort* by providing an envelope pattern – an established and symmetrical design – as the unit begins and ends with Latin, and shows that the compiler:
‘added *Exhort* and *Summons* in that order to *JDayII* [in an attempt to] copy a complex technical convention’ (Whitbread, 1957: 128). In a similar manner, the final lines of *JDayI* and the conclusion of *ResB* provide a comparable envelope pattern to the Exeter Book unit, repeating the exhortation to reflect upon the fate of one’s soul (see discussion above, p. 75-76).

The final poems of the CCCC 201 unit are *LPrII* and *GlorI*; initially, these texts appear initially to pose a problem with the argument that they also work as part of a wider conceptual unit, as they are written in a different, later hand to the preceding three poems, datable to the mid-eleventh century, and separated from the previous text, *Summons* by an enlarged, green *littera notabilior*.

![Figure 5](https://example.com/figure5)

*Figure 5: p. 167. Closing line of *Summons* and opening green *littera notabilior* P of *LPrII*.*

We might compare also the opening of *GlorI*, indicated by the first, red *littera notabilior* S in the following figure:
Caie (1994) has demonstrated that these two texts have strong verbal links to one another which is suggestive of common authorship for these two poems;\(^9\) further, both are didactic, devotional exercises, based on the two prayers of the Gloria and the Lord’s Prayer, each taking one line of the relevant liturgical prayer and elaborating on it. As Whitbread argues, the two poems are ‘companion pieces by the same author at the same time’ (1962: 41). In addition, the use of macronic verse through *JDayII* to *Summons* also links with similar practice within *LPRII* and *Glori*; what we have here, then, are two distinct textual groups which, though written by different scribes and at slightly different times, were placed together by the manuscript compiler to create a collection of didactic texts which have a clear purpose: to bring the audience from worldly sin to final absolution. In this respect they can be better understood not as isolated works, but in their manuscript context as a conceptual unit, designed to mirror the function of a penitential sermon in the form of devotional exercises for an individual.

3.4.2 Using Manuscript Evidence

This practice not only mirrors the structure of the conceptual unit identified in this thesis within the Exeter Book, but therefore also proposes possible manuscript evidence for the Exeter Book unit from the layout and textual division and subordination of these poems within the CCCC 201 manuscript. As outlined earlier in this section, the division markers used between *JDayI*, *ResA*

\(^9\) For further details of these verbal links, see Caie (1994: 159).
and \textit{ResB} are of interest in their varied used of decoration and accompanying mixed majuscules. The evidence provided by CCCC 201 therefore suggests that an examination of division markers in the Exeter Book would be worthwhile. Additionally, the similarities between these thematic units of CCCC 201 and the Exeter Book suggest a particular devotional function that such compilation sought to provide. In order to argue that these texts were placed together for a specific meditative purpose, whose aim was to inspire confession and penance, it is necessary at this point to examine the context in which such practices would function. The very fact that two similar collections of texts survive suggests this was a tradition not unique simply to either manuscript, but reveals a textual response to either an established or an idealised religious practice. As Caie (1994) and Robinson (1989) have demonstrated, there are two sets of texts within CCCC 201 which are placed together for a common purpose. The same can be said of the Exeter Book: \textit{JDayI}, \textit{ResA} and \textit{ResB} can be seen as the first unit (compare \textit{JDayII} – \textit{Summons}) while \textit{Desc} to \textit{HomFriII} can be seen as the second (compare \textit{LPrII} and \textit{GlorI}).

It is important to note that the texts of the Exeter Book unit are written not in Latin but in the vernacular, suggesting they were intended for the laity, or more specifically perhaps, the lay clergy.\textsuperscript{91} As Æthelwold shows in ‘Edgar’s establishment of the monasteries’ there was a need to overcome the linguistic barrier presented by Latin as the language of the church:

\begin{quote}
Wel mæg dugan hit naht mid hwylcan gereorde mon y gestryned 7 to þan soðan geleafan gewæmed, butan þæt an sy þæt he Gode gegange. Hæbban forþi þa ungelæreden inlendisse þæs halgan regales cyþþe þurh agenes gereorðes anwirgenesse, þæt hy þe geornlicor Gode þeowien and nane tale næbben þæt hy þurh nytennesse misfon þurfen.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{[It certainly cannot matter by what language a man is acquired and drawn to the true faith, as long only as he comes to God. Therefore let the unlearned natives have the knowledge of this holy rule by the exposition of their own language, that they may the more zealously serve God and have no excuse that they were driven by ignorance to err.]}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{91} Though it should be noted here that elsewhere in the Exeter Book, Latin can be found: \textit{Phoen} is a macaronic text.
By providing religious instruction in the vernacular, including poetry, our conceptual units in CCCC 201 and the Exeter Book appear to have the function of a penitential sermon used to inspire compunction and lead to acts of confession.

3.5 The Context of Meditation, Confession and Penance

Though there is an absence in *JDayl, ResA* and *ResB* of any specific reference to confession with a priest, by the tenth century when the manuscript was compiled priestly confession was obligatory; this suggests these texts were intended specifically to aid and inspire priestly confession, rather than private, personal confession which was common practice from the eighth century (Caie 1994: 162; Frantzen 1983: 185). Frantzen (1983) emphasises the need for confessors at this time to deal with the theory of penance in conjunction with the practice of penance which vernacular literature of this kind encouraged. Though penitential handbooks contained specific formula for penance, there was a growing need for literature that prepared one for penance and additionally put the audience in the correct mood for doing so. Frantzen states,

The heightened spiritual awareness achieved in confession was sustained by means of prayer, preaching and poetry. These literary forms, discursive and devotional, were better able than the penitentials to supply themes and images to reinforce the sinner’s conversion (Frantzen, 1983: 11-12).

These poems may therefore be better understood to reflect the Anglo-Saxon penitential tradition. In CCCC 201 a number of texts can be found which support the use of these poems for penitential purposes. Alongside Wulfstan’s Benedictine Office (pp. 112-14 in the manuscript) there also appears ‘Handbook for the Use of a Confessor’ (pp. 114-125). The inclusion of a text designed for use by a confessor is of interest as to the function of this group, suggesting the works may have been compiled with the intention they were to be read by the individual penitent, by the priest (confessor) to the penitent, or to the lay clergy more generally. The inclusion of these particular poems and prayers in a manuscript which also includes Wulfstanian sermons, and a fragment of the Old English *Regularis concordia*, the code of monastic observance, are suggestive of its function: the manuscript has been interpreted as a version of
Archbishop Wulfstan's Handbook. Caie (1994: 160) provides evidence of a possible function of the CCCC 201 unit by linking it to a Wulfstanian Doomsday homily (WHomXXIX) found in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 113, f.68r-70v. As he shows, this homily contains a substantial section of JDayII in addition to didactic teaching on penance. Caie argues it is clear the homilist is preparing the audience for confession as he selects passages from JDayII designed to instil fear, and thus inspire penance; in relation to the CCCC 201 group, he states:

> the five poems appear to have the same function as a penitential sermon, but in the form of devotional exercises [...] it would, therefore, be in keeping that this Wulfstanian manuscript [CCCC 201] provided the priest with a series of poems that would help him lead the penitent from a state of sin to final absolution. (Caie 1994: 160)

The compilation of these texts in CCCC 201, and the context of that manuscript more generally provides an insight into the compilation of similar texts in the Exeter Book; that is, that its function may have been to aid penitential practice. In JDayI, the inclusion of phrases such as ‘Forþon ic a wille leode læran’ (ll. 45-46) and ‘Onewep nu þisne cwide’ (l. 114) are of interest, as they are explicitly didactic, suggesting the poet is not a fellow sinner but a priest addressing a penitent. This connects with the remaining poems of the wider Exeter Book group (Desc – HomFrII), which are prayer-like in nature, as the penitent is given these additional prayers to contemplate or recite, including the Lord’s Prayer (LPrI), which helps bring the confession to a close and mirrors the close of the unit in CCCC 201. As Thompson explains: ‘the minimum requirements for admission to communion and Christian burial were a knowledge of the Paternoster and Creed.’ (2004: 38)

---

94 See also other collections of texts designed for private devotion, or miscellanies which are penitential in nature: Libellus Sacrarum Precum; MS. Royal 2 A.xx in MS Harley 2965 (The Book of Nunaminster); MS Cotton Vespasian D.xx; MS Royal 2B.v.; MS Cotton Tiberius A.iii; MS Harley 7653; and the Book of Cerne which also contains confessional prayers; prayers 8 and 10 are particularly comparable to ResA. On the subject see Bestul (1977).
I here argue that the compilation of these texts in the Exeter Book is an earlier example of the tradition of collecting together devotional texts that we find in CCCC 201. In both the conceptual unit of *DayI*, *ResA* and *ResB* and the wider group from *DayI* – *HomFrII*, the manuscript compiler or scribe has collected a series of devotional exercises which close with prayer; each group has a clear, chronological purpose, taking the audience (or penitent) from worldly sin and the horrors of Judgement to final absolution – just as we see in CCCC 201.

3.5.1 The Context of Penitential Practice

As Michelle Brown argues the compilation of manuscripts such as the Exeter Book are, best viewed in the context of the drive to gather and codify knowledge exhibited by the Anglo-Saxon church during the later tenth and early eleventh centuries [...] to fulfil the study needs of the individual, as well as continuing [to supply] essential liturgical and devotional tools of their faith. (Brown 2001: 115)

It is important therefore to pose the following questions: first, if these texts were compiled as devotional texts, what were the purposes of exercises of this sort; and second, which were the specific religious celebrations for which they were they designed and used? As discussed in Section II, these poems have previously been argued to be linked to Easter as they each deal with themes of penance, Judgement, redemption and eternal life after death. Easter is the season that is most closely linked to the Parousia (the second coming of Christ), as it celebrates the resurrection of Christ and therefore looks forward to Doomsday and the resurrection of humankind (see Caie 1976; also Section II p. 25ff). This practice therefore formed the focus of prayers, penance and meditation on the theme of Judgement Day. The link between Easter and Doomsday can be seen in Blickling Homily *Dominica Pascha* where it specifies that Doomsday will occur at Easter because this season betokens eternal life (specifically ll. 1-10). Further, reference in *DayI* to Christ being bound to the ‘brightly shining’ cross (*ful blacne beam* l. 63a) provides an additional typological link between the events of the Crucifixion and the Parousia; the use of the cross and the Crucifixion here is the same iconographic symbol used as the centrepiece in *ChrIII*, in which it serves, in both poems, as a summons for man to Judgement and

95 Michelle Brown makes this statement in relation to poetic manuscripts such as the Exeter and Vercelli Books, and the *Beowulf* manuscript (London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A. xv part II).
is both a sign of salvation and a sign of terror (Caie 1976: 163). In many of the Exeter Book poems, and surviving homilies in Vercelli, Blicking, and later in Wulfstan and Ælfric, themes relating to the Last Judgement, the events of Judgement Day and the Apocalypse and the resurrection of mankind can be seen. As McC. Gatch states,

It cannot be stressed too strongly that the events of the last times, of the last day with its resurrection and Judgement, were at the very centre of Christian eschatology in the earliest centuries of the Christian community and in early medieval times. That is to say, the primary concern was with the ultimate salvation of the world, or at least of the People of God. (Gatch 1991: 196).

*JDayI, ResA and ResB* are no exception; they describe the Last Times as they appear to the individual penitent. Together, they emphasise the importance of mental self-examination as a cure for the soul, made sick by sins committed on earth. This ‘soul-cure’ was essential to ensure salvation in an interim paradise upon death, and everlasting salvation at the Last Judgement. As Grundy explains,

All must face the death of the body. Ultimately the most important part of the priest’s work is the task of encouraging the people in his charge to prepare for death while they still have the opportunity to change their lives for the better. Delay may mean disaster for the soul after death. (Grundy 1991: 212)

Wulfstan’s *De Anticristo*, for example, displays similar pleas to the clergy for the need for priests to prepare their congregations for the coming of the Antichrist and the end of the world.

---

97 Gilchrist detailed a theory that death formed a fifth stage in the ‘Age of Man’ topos in a series of lectures that formed part of the Dalrymple Lectures in European Archaeology held at the University of Glasgow in March 2011. In her lectures, she argued that death, according the archaeological and burial evidence, was not considered final, but part of the journey of life which continued in the afterlife. This research can also been seen in its early stages (mainly in relation to gender) in her 2011 and 2004 publications. Two works relating directly to the content of her lectures are forthcoming (2012).

98 See Kabir (2001) for a detailed examination of the Anglo-Saxon belief in an interim paradise, as a predecessor to the concept of purgatory.

3.5.2 The Feast of Rogationtide in Anglo-Saxon Homilies

Of interest at this point are a number of homilies that can be understood to have been composed for a very similar purpose – to help focus the preparations of the audience for the Feast of the Ascension, rather than Easter, which also included this care for the soul. Specifically, these homilies were designed for use during days of penance leading up to Ascension Day, a period also known as Rogation. Rogation can be understood as two distinct festivals, one ‘according to the rite of the Roman church’ known as litania major, and the second ‘according to the custom of our forefathers, three days before the Ascension of our Lord into the heavens’. It is the second of these that concerns us here. Rogationtide can be originally attributed to Mamertus, Bishop of Vienne, who instituted a three-day fast before Ascension Day (c.470) to ease the misfortunes that had befallen the city and its churches. The festival of Rogationtide was not recognised in Roman use until the papacy of Leo III (795-816) who then also ordered processions on these three days. On the observances of the period of Rogationtide, under ‘Litanies’ the Old English Matrylogy reads:

Ymb þas dagas utan, hwilum ær, hwilum æfter, beoð þa þry dagas on þæm godes ciricum, ond Cristes folc mærsiða letanias, þæt is þonne bene ond relicgongas, foran to Cristes uppastignesse.

[About this time, sometimes earlier, sometimes later, are the three days in the churches of God and the people of Christ celebrate Letanias, that is then prayers and relic-processions, before the Ascension of Christ.]  

The Rogationtide liturgy is celebrated in anticipation that it will act as a supplicant to God, that it will appease him, and that so appeased, he will lessen the burdens of the prayerful community (Harris 2007: 151). Ælfric, in his First Series homily for Monday in Rogationtide (ÆCH I.XVIII) emphasises that there should be prayers for wealth, health, peace and (most importantly here) for forgiveness of sins. Bazire and Cross suggest the following themes for Rogation: penance, care...

---

100 Quoted in Bazire and Cross, 1989 from D. Wilkins Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae (London 1737) I, 97: ‘juxta ritum Romanæ ecclesiae […] secundum morem priorum nostrorum, tres dies ante asensionem Domini in caelos’.


103 Text and translation from Herzfeld (1900: 72-73).
of the soul, catechism, learning and correct behaviour (1982: xxiv). The Old English Martyrology refers to this topic of ‘care of the soul’ in its entry ‘Litanies’ for Rogationtide:

[These three days are a medicine for a man’s soul and spiritual potion; therefore they have to be kept with compunction of the heart.]\textsuperscript{104}

The reference to the \textit{gastlic wyrtдрenc} is here reminiscent of \textit{MSol} that describes the Paternoster in particular as ‘soul’s honey’ (\textit{sawle hunig} l. 134) and ‘mind’s milk’ (\textit{modes meolc} l. 135), thereby offering prayer, confession and penance as a remedy or cure for the soul. Such is the power of confession that it ‘not only repairs the damaged soul, it can even resurrect the soul killed by sin, as \AE{}lfric shows in his homily for the first Sunday after Easter, when he compares unconfessed sins to Lazarus’s shroud in an extended analogy’ (Thompson 2004: 59):

\begin{quote}
Crist arærde of deaðe þone stincendan lazarum; 7 þa ða he cucu wæs þa cwæð he to his leorningcnihtum: tolysað his bendas [...] For ði sceolon þa lareowas þa unbindan from heora synnum, þa ðe geliffast þurh onbryrdynesse; ælc sinful man þe his synna bediglað, he bið dead on byrgene. Ac gif he his synna geandet þurh onbryrdneysse, þonne gæð he of ðære byrgene [...] Ðonne sceal se lareow hine unbindan fram þam ecum wite.
\end{quote}

\textit{[Christ revived the stinking Lazarus from death; and when he was revived, then He said to His disciples: unfasten his bonds [...] Therefore teachers must release from their sins those who are endowed with life through compunction; every sinful man who conceals his sins he is dead in the grave. But if he confess through compunction, then he comes out of the grave [...] Then the teacher must release him from eternal torment.] (ÆCH I.XVI II. 81-9)\textsuperscript{105}

In this respect, compunction, confession and the role of homilist, priest or teacher are significant in providing remedy for the sinful soul; each of these are equally central in \textit{JDayI}, \textit{ResA} and \textit{ResB}. I would here like to argue these poems may in fact be better understood as being designed for use slightly later than Easter, that is, in preparation for the Feast of the Ascension, as this is the culmination of specific spiritual preparations of Rogationtide that would include fasting, prayer and personal reflection (see Bazire and Cross 1989). Therefore, rather than being

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{104} Ibid.
\end{flushright}
designed for use at Easter *per se*, I propose that it is this Rogationtide observance of prayers of penance into which the conceptual units of CCCC 201 – and in particular of the Exeter Book – fit. As Thompson explains,

> the fluid and intertextual nature of Anglo-Saxon poetry [...] results in what Pasternack calls ‘anonymous polyphony’, [...] drawing from a well of common tradition [...] to suggest that some at least of the poems and homilies may have emerged from the same environments. (Thompson 2004: 48, citing Pasternack 1991)\(^{106}\)

A closer examination of certain Rogationtide homilies from the Vercelli Book reveals further links between these units and the Feast of the Ascension which supports this argument.

### 3.5.3 Vercelli Homilies XIX-XXI\(^{107}\)

The fact that twenty-four Old English Rogationtide sermons are extant ‘demonstrates just how significant the event was in the Anglo-Saxon preaching cycle’ (Fox 2009: 255). Of specific interest to the Exeter Book conceptual unit are the *Vercelli Homilies XIX – XXI (VercHomXIX-XXI)*; composed in the latter part of the tenth century, they form an organised set, detailing the trinity, the creation and concluding with a long description of the terror of the last Judgement (Scragg 1973: 194-5 and 203-4; Szarmach 1978: 244 and 248; Bazire and Cross 1982; Scragg 1992: 181-92).\(^{108}\)

Upon inspection, the parallels between *JDayI*, *JDayII* and these homilies are immediately apparent: the third homily (*VercHomXXI*) of this set in particular stresses the approach of final Judgement and the need for the audience to prepare themselves, before providing a striking vision of the last day, which echoes that found in *JDayI* and *JDayII*. A further link between these

---

\(^{106}\) See Teresi (2000) for discussion of the homilists’ ‘mnemonic repertoire’.

\(^{107}\) For an examination of the style and rhetoric of the Vercelli Homilies, see Zacher (2003).

\(^{108}\) In the Vercelli Book, Scragg argues that there are only four ‘blocks’ of prose texts which appear to have been copied continuously: homilies VI-X; homilies XI-XIV; homilies XV-XVIII and the homilies discussed here, XIX-XXI. For a review of the literature arguing for homilies XIX-XXI as a unit, see Fox (2009: 256); Fox shows that current understanding rests with Scragg’s latest work (1992: 181-92) which argues for the three homilies as a unit and shows the three homilies to have the same author as Pembroke College MS 25, see also Cross 1987.
homilies and CCCC 201 is that VercHomXXI (ll. 126-57) has previously been argued to use Exhort as a source where ll. 149-55 in particular of the homily quote only in slightly altered form the opening of the Exhort (Scragg, 1992: 348). Additionally, a link can be seen between VercHomXIX and ResB. At first glance VercHomXIX, the first of the three homilies in this set, does not appear to have much in common with either the Exeter Book or CCCC 201 units, detailing as it does the creation of the world, the fall of the angels, and the creation and fall of Adam and Eve, before moving to a general exhortation to the audience to follow Christian teaching and introducing the three Rogation days of penance before the Ascension. However, upon further examination, the homilist introduces two examples of the success of three days of penance and prayer (an important theme during Rogationtide): that is, the delivery of Jonah and the saving of Vienne.

As detailed in Section II (pp. 68ff), Deskis (1998) examines ResB as the lament of a specific character from a recognised narrative by offering the narrative of the biblical story of Jonah. Of particular interest here is that Deskis links ResB to VercHomXIX, which gives the most expansive version of the history of Jonah in the homilies (Deskis 1998: 193). Though she does not argue for a textual link between ResB and VercHomXIX – and it should be noted neither do I – the connections of theme between ResB, the Jonah story and VercHomXIX in particular do highlight the possibility that the manuscript compiler of the Exeter Book would have been familiar with a) the concept of collections of religious texts, compiled together to be read for a specific purpose, i.e. Rogationtide, and b) the collections of texts which refer to both the approach of Judgement Day and the biblical story of Jonah. Further, that one of the homilies uses Exhort as a source again indicates that the homilist or compiler of VercHomXIX-XX recognised in CCCC 201 a collection of material similar to those they had perhaps used before at Rogationtide, that could offer them material for a new composition. In this way, the existence of two poetic conceptual units, headed by a poem using the subject of Judgement Day, and with a similar penitential function, provides evidence of a wider tradition of collecting poetic texts together. Further, evidence from the VercHomXIX-XXI on Rogationtide provides confirmation of the purpose of these poetic units: that is, they were compiled for use during the three days of Rogation leading to Ascension Day in order that they should assist the penitent in gaining
awareness of the needs of his soul, help them learn to meditate well upon this truth and the coming Judgement, and inspire them to engage in confession and penance in order to cleanse their souls. This care for the soul therefore formed part of the Rogationtide preparations for the religious feast of the Ascension which in turn helped the penitent ready his soul for Judgement Day, typologically linked to this period.

3.5.4 Care for the Soul

In their edition of Old English homilies on Rogationtide, Bazire and Cross state:

The repetitions of idea which occur [in these homilies] create a picture of Rogationtide as a time not only of severe penance like that of Lent […] but also of care for the soul by means of the commanded observances. It is a time for listening to the teachers […] and, for taking the warning of the Doomsday to come. The visualization of Doomsday is created from the popular apocrypha and from other descriptions, and almost becomes a homiletic topos (Bazire and Cross 1989: xxiv).

This statement could well be a description of the conceptual units found within the Exeter Book and CCCC 201: each unit provides an exhortation to the audience to listen to what is being taught, to take heed of the warning of Judgement day, and to care for the soul via prayer, self reflection and acts of penance. In particular, previous negative criticism of JDayI as a text based on popular apocrypha, branded simply as ‘homiletic’ in tone, and therefore of supposed lesser value (as opposed to JDayII, which has Bede as its source), is now given a more established context. As Meens argues, these themes of penance and confession abound within early medieval sermons; the audience is continually reminded of the importance of confessing and atoning for one’s sins, and reflecting on one’s fate at Judgement (1998: 53). The commanded observances during Rogationtide can all be seen as visual forms of penance that include, fasting, prayer, and processing, alms-giving and potential exclusion from communion (Bazire and Cross 1989: xxiv). These could also all form part of what has been termed ‘private penance’ which was in fact more of a communal ritual than this description initially suggests (Meens 1998). Confession and communion were closely linked religious practices especially at certain periods of the liturgical year, of which Rogationtide was one. Confession originated in monastic practice via devotional confession, where the intention was to guide the monk to perfection; Meens (1998: 53) argues that if we think of secret, or private penance in terms of a communal ritual, it becomes much
easier to understand confession on two levels: the priest as policing the penitential practice of his community as well as hearing and leading confessions. This is significant when we consider the unit of *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB*, which clearly include both the voice of a teacher (*JDayI*), the response of the penitent (*ResA*) and the response of the un-confessed sinner (*ResB*): the act of confession and penance, here, is both personal and communal, which fits with confessional practice more generally at the time, and is consistent with the practices and observances expected during Rogationtide. As Thompson explains,

Confession is [...] presented as a rehearsal both for the death-bed and for the awe-inspiring events of Doomsday. For those who confess even annually, the journey to and beyond death becomes a progress towards a final destination of total self-knowledge, with acts of confession and penance as interim landmarks of introspection on this route. The final destination is the Last Judgement, represented as both confessional and courtroom, where all is revealed, and any sins unconfessed in life will be exposed to public gaze through a ‘glassily transparent’ body. (Thompson 2004: 59)

It is this journey to knowledge which I argue the compilation of *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB* (as well as *JDayII – GlorI* in CCCC 201) sought to inspire. In her monograph on religious writing in late Anglo-Saxon England, Lees argues that ‘Christian knowledge brings understanding, but that understanding must be transformed into action’ (1999: 110). She continues by quoting from Ælfric who comments on this point in one of his Easter homilies:

**Be ðison we magon tocnavan. Þæt us is twyfeald neod on boclicum gewritum; Anfeald neod us is. Þæt we ða boclican lare mid carfullum mode smeagan. Oðer þæt we hi to weorcum awendan.**

**[Regarding this, we may know that there is for us a twofold need in scriptural writings. Our first need is that we consider with careful mind bookish doctrine; the other is that we turn it into works.]**[109] *(ÆCH II.XVI ll. 31-32).*

Therefore understanding and action played a dual role and were the ‘major contribution of vernacular religious writing to the continuing project of maintaining a Christian society in

---

109 The image of the ‘glassily transparent body’ is present in both *ChrIII* (ll. 1281b-82) *Beoð pa syngan flæsc / scandum furhwaden swa þæt scire glæs*: ‘Their sinful flesh will be shamefully pierced through like the clear glass’ (trans. Bradley 1982: 239) and *BHomX* (ll. 47-49): *and þa deadan upastandad, bip bonne se flæschoma ascyréd swa gles ne mæg þæs unrihtes beon ðawiht bedigled*: ‘Then the dead shall stand up and their bodies shall be as transparent as glass with no nakedness concealed’ (text and translation from Kelly (2003: 78-79)).

England’ (Lees 1999: 111). Compilations of texts such as *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB* were designed to aid understanding and prompt action among the audience, particularly important during Rogationtide when there was a specific emphasis on compunction (understanding) and confession and penance (action) so that ‘care of the soul’ could take place. As Grundy points out:

In his preaching on the Last Days Ælfric encourages the Christian to make appropriate preparations for the soul’s journey after death [...]:

Ælc man him ondræt þæs lichaman deað
and feawa him ondrædað þære sawle deað.
Þam lichaman men tíliað, þe lange lybban ne mæg,
and ne tíliað þære sawle þe ne swelt on ecnysse.

*Everyone fears the death of the body, and few fear the death of the soul. People take care of the body, which cannot live long, and do not take care of the soul, which does not perish in eternity.* (ÆHomXI ll. 118-21, cited in Grundy 1991: 216-17)\(^\text{111}\)

Therefore, the importance of providing care for the soul is forcibly portrayed in religious poetry (such as our three poems) and also religious prose, where an emphasis on being spiritually prepared for death through compunction, mental self-examination and the penitent’s journey to wisdom is often central.

The search for a remedy for the *sorge* and *longung*\(^\text{112}\) suffered by the earth-bound soul is a motif common to Old English poetry. *Sfr* dramatises the protagonist’s search for such a remedy, eventually allowing him to address the anxieties of the four Last Things (Death, Judgement, Heaven and Hell). As Gillespie argues:

That poem’s conclusion: ‘Dol bið se þe his drhyten ne ondrædeð. Cymeð him seo deað unþinged’ (l. 106) (Foolish is he who does not fear his Lord; death comes to him unreflected on) aligns itself ideologically and verbally with the proverbial lore found elsewhere in the Exeter Book:

Dol biþ se þe dryhten nat, to þæs oft cymeð deað unþinged;
snotre men sawlum beorgað, healdæ hyra sóð mid ryhte.


\(^{112}\) *Sfr* l. 42 and l. 47 respectively.
(A man who does not know his lord is a fool: death often comes unexpectedly to him. Wise men look after their souls, they uphold their integrity with justice. *Maxims I* ll. 35-36.)

[...], This journey, with its ‘gastlic’ (*The Wanderer* l. 73b: ‘terrifying’ as well as ‘spiritual’) consequences, is a journey to wisdom: in theory, the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. (Gillespie 2011: 54-55)

It is this wisdom which forms the core of *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB*: as a unit, the poems focus the mind of the audience on the present state of their souls and the journey it will make at death. The same sentiment is also present in *SoulI*:

Huru ðæs behoфаð hæleda æghwyłe
þæt he his sawle sið sylfa gefence,
uh þæt bið deopl ic þonne se deað cymeð:
lic on sawle.

[Certainly it is necessary for every man to consider for himself the journey his soul will have to make, how terrible it will be when death comes, and separates the kinsmen who were once joined: the soul and the body.] (*SoulI* ll. 1-5a)\(^{113}\)

Therefore, the soul suffers the sins of the body\(^{114}\) and any sins left unconfessed at death will be exposed to all mankind at the Last Judgment. Gatch explains,

[...] the beings judged would be not just spirit or soul but embodied creatures. Thus what happens to the individual between the moment of death and the hour of the general resurrection was a matter of comparative indifference. [...] the way one lived affected one’s own future indeed; but it was more important that the way one lived was a part of the history of salvation, of the great drama of which the resurrection was the pivotal point. (1991: 196-97)

According to *ÆHomXI*: ‘Sermo ad Populum, in Octavis Pentecosten Dicendus’, death is experienced in two ways: spiritual and physical (ll. 118ff).\(^{115}\) As Gatch summarises, ‘everyone fears the former – which all, nevertheless experience – but not enough take adequate account of

---

\(^{113}\) As edited by Shippey (1976: 104-11); translation his (p. 105).

\(^{114}\) Gatch states that ‘it is generally agreed by historians that the doctrine of purgatory was not fully developed until at least a century after the time of Ælfric (1991: 198). However, for a more recent study of paradise, death and doomsday in Anglo-Saxon literature see Kabir (2001) who argues persuasively that the Anglo-Saxons held a belief in the ‘interim paradise’. She argues this was understood to be a temporary abode for good souls following death and before Doomsday, and is upheld in the writings of Bede and Ælfric and also present in Old English poetry.

spiritual death, which comes through sin and cannot claim righteous men and women’ (1991: 197-98). This in turn, leads to an emphasis on the importance of making confession and doing penance. As Thompson explains, ‘people are encouraged to see making confession as a foretaste of their experience at Doomsday’ (2004: 59). As the homilist of VercHomIX advises, the audience should prepare themselves so that they are not ashamed of their deeds on Judgment Day; so much worse is the shame if it is brought before all mankind at the Last Judgement (VercHomIX II. 206-09). This belief, coupled with the emphasis that Doomsday will itself be sudden and unexpected (Luke 17: 20-37; Matthew 24: 15-31; Mark 13: 14-27) contributed to the practice of care for the soul so that having confessed and undergone penance, one’s soul is fully prepared for Judgement. This belief subsequently produced texts, or inspired compilations of texts, that stressed the importance of living in a constant state of preparedness.

3.5.5 Compunction and Mental Self-Examination

JDayI, ResA and ResB show a preoccupation with ‘thinking well’ and as a unit they promote the mental self-examination necessary among the audience to prompt compunction and therefore confession and penance. Though Alcuin and Augustine differed in their conceptions of the soul as it related to the mind (mens), they both linked mental activity to God. As Godden explains,

Alcuin’s interest is particularly in the way that the soul’s mental activity mirrors God, as a testimony to its spiritual nature and high status: the soul, he says, ‘is ennobled with the image and likeness of the Creator in its principal part, which is called the mens’ [...] For Augustine, the mind resembles God only in as far as it contemplates eternal truths [...] For Alcuin it is the mind’s power to remember or imagine people and places that shows its God-like quality. (Godden 1985: 273)

Either way, the importance of mental self-examination in relation to God is significant: by encouraging the audience to ‘think well’, JDayI, ResA and ResB bring each penitent closer to

116 See also the opening section of Ælfric’s supplementary homily XVIII De die Iudicii (Pope (1967-68)).
117 Similar fears of suffering a sudden and unprepared death are also seen in the opening section of JDayII where the speaker is found in a sheltered, pleasant grove beside a river, which is then threatened by a dark sky that looks to upset these pleasant surroundings. This causes him distress of mind; fearful of his Last Judgement, because of his unconfessed sins, the speaker begins his speech which sets the penitential mood for the poem and offers him the chance of forgiveness.
118 For a discussion of the concept of the soul as set out by both Alcuin and Augustine, see Godden (1985).
God which in turn encouraged them to make confession: this constituted their ‘care of the soul’. Anderson (1986) argues *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB* are part of a wider unit (*Wife – Ruin*) which together form an ‘Easter Riddle’ linking the two groups of *Riddles* in the Exeter Book. Though his argument that these texts constitute a ‘riddlic rejoinder’ (1986: 99ff) in the manuscript seems a little extreme, and though he relates these texts to Easter rather than Rogationtide and the Feast of the Ascension, he does note a series of common themes between these poems which is of use here. *JDayI, ResA, ResB, Descent Alms* and *Phar* are collected together in his edition as they each refer to a spiritual journey (see discussion of *ResA* and *ResB* in Section II); further *Desc* provides the unit with a text which reflects on the journey of purification by baptism (detailing the life of John the Baptist and referring to Christ’s journey from hell. *Alms* and *Phar* pursue this theme of baptism by scriptural and liturgical reference. *Phar* ‘details the escape of Israel through the Red Sea, a story typologically related to the waters of baptism’ while *Alms* ‘catechizes the scriptural relation of alms to baptism [reflecting] customary penitential practice, the necessary human acceptance of divine forgiveness and grace’ (Anderson 1986: 79; 81). To this unit, *LPrI* and *HomFrII* work together to emphasise the main ingredients of penance, so strongly associated with Rogationtide and provide what Franzten terms the ‘literary expressions of such penitential instruction’ to the unit (Franzten 1983). *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB* therefore seek to allow the penitent to ‘learn patience and submission to God along the meditative way’ (Anderson 1986: 81) taken during Rogationtide and offered by this poetic unit. In his analysis of these poems as a collection, Anderson makes the following important point, which I include in full here:

> [the unit] does not contradict or deny the scholarly readings of its separate poems [but the sustained theme across the unit] attains the allegorical meaning of divine and human dying to a new life. The victory over death through the Passion and Resurrection and the correspondent cleaning of human nature through [...] the chief spiritual events of Eastertide, are the invisible framework for the arranged poems. (1986: 81)

While I do not agree with Anderson on these poems being an extended riddle, or relating specifically to Easter, I do agree with him on his above statement. The collections of poems such as we find in the Exeter Book and CCCC 201 are indicative of a response to the need for texts that can be used for communal and personal confession, specifically for use during Rogation days. In addition, these are poetic units which show a redirection of content – as compared with
homilies such as *VercHomXIX-XXI* which charted creation through to Judgement – taking, as they do, the most dramatic material (Judgement Day and the care for the soul) and expounding on these particular details to focus the intentions of the penitent and the poems for most effective use in focusing the mind in preparation for the Feast of the Ascension.

3.6 Contextual Evidence and Manuscript Evidence
The importance of manuscript context in this interpretation of *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB* prompts us to return again to the manuscript. If the compiler had intended for these poems to be read together as a unit, he may well have indicated this through use of division markers, in a manner not dissimilar to the textual division practice found in CCCC 201, detailed earlier in this section. The thematic and palaeographical evidence of CCCC 201 proves the importance of examining a text, or group of texts, within their manuscript context. Therefore, it is of interest to discuss here how similar manuscript evidence of *litterae notabiliores* distribution in the Exeter Book might support a reading of *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB* as a conceptual unit. Certainly, there are points of interest relating to size and decoration of *litterae notabiliores* and the distribution (or lack thereof) of mixed majuscules throughout *JDayI* and *ResA* which require further investigation.\(^\text{119}\)

3.7 Litterae Notabiliores, Final Punctuation and Spacing in *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB*
The use of *litterae notabiliores*, final punctuation and spacing at the start of *JDayI* and *ResA*, in addition to an enlarged initial part way through *JDayI*, is here argued to be of significance in the interpretations of these poems:

![Figure 7: f.115v. *JDayI*, l. 1](image)

*Littera notabilior ð*, presented with decoration and accompanied by no mixed majuscules

\(^{119}\) As the first folio of *ResB* is lost, so are any opening *litterae notabiliores* and mixed majuscules which may have been used.
The ð at the opening of JDayI is a decorated initial measuring 2.5 lines of text in height. Conversely, the initial A at the beginning of ResA has been rendered without decoration, despite being similar in size to the ð of JDayI. Perhaps of most interest, however, is the initial Þ partway through JDayI that measures over 4.5 lines of text in height, almost double that of the ð or the A of JDayI or ResA respectively, and is rendered with decoration. This initial Þ is also the only of the three to be followed by two square majuscules from the opening word wile: I and L.

3.7.1 Spacing as a Division Marker in JDayI, ResA and ResB

Upon examination of the manuscript, we can see there seems to be a divergence from customary spacing practice at this point in the manuscript. Rather than spacing occurring between the last line of one text and the first line of the next, it is the first line of a new text that bears the spacing: either one half or one third of the opening line is blank, like so:

[An examination of spacing practice in the Exeter Book is given in Section IV: Manuscript Evidence.]
JDayI is the first poem to demonstrate this practice, with a half of its opening line being blank; this is mirrored by the opening line of ResA that does the same and Descent which has one third of its opening line blank. In each instance, the preceding line of the last text does not include any spacing traditionally employed in the rest of the manuscript. No full blank line spacing is given between any of these texts. The only division in these texts to follow traditional spacing is found at 1. 80 of JDayI, which serves further to mark out that particular division in addition to the use of littera notabilior and mixed majuscules at this point in the text.

In considering the placement of the litterae notabiliiores within these particular texts alongside our thematic reading of all three, it is apparent that the first subdivision, the littera notabilior Ƿ in JDayI, occurs after 1. 80, between the descriptions of the worldly man and his punishment, and the reward of the deep-thinking man. In this respect, the decorated initial Ƿ separates the different types of man at the last Judgement, setting the focus of the poetic unit, while the undecorated initial A at the beginning of ResA marks out the opening of a response to JDayI in which a prayer is spoken by the deep-thinking man. In this respect, rather than being considered an isolated new work, ResA functions to instruct man on his ideal response to his coming death and Judgement. ResB then closes the group, presenting the actions of the little-thinking speaker as spiritual faults for the audience to reflect upon, in order to encourage meditation of their own faults and ultimately to promote repentance.

The subordination found within these texts is particularly interesting when compared with the visual and thematic division found in ChrIII, (see Section IV for further discussion). In this text,
the detail of the damned soul at Judgement in ChrIII is marked from the preceding and following sections of text by a littera notabilior; the detail of the pure souls is laid out as part of a larger section in the text. It is of interest that in both ChrIII and JDayI, the text should divide the good and bad souls from one another. In ChrIII, the manuscript division draws attention to this detailed description and divides the good from bad; in JDayI it works in the opposite way, detailing first the bad and then the good. This serves to reinforce the poet’s focus on thinking well before one’s death and final Judgement, and emphasises his didactic aim that directs the audience to follow the deeds of the well-thinking man. Equally, the initial which marks out the traditional opening of ResA can here be seen to mark a section of the conceptual unit which is subordinate to those which precede it in JDayI; the text of ResA (and therefore ResB by default) extend and exemplify the warnings and characterisations set out within JDayI, just as subordinate sections have been shown to do in ChrIII and between JDayII, and the following poems Exhort and Summons in CCCC 201. Though the texts of JDayI, ResA and ResB were likely written separately, the thematic evidence nevertheless indicates they were placed together by the manuscript compiler or scribe to function as a unit within the wider manuscript context.

3.8 Section III: Conclusion
Manuscript information such as layout and visual division of texts using litterae notabiliiores and mixed majuscules reveals further evidence of manuscript compilation which I here argue reflects the intended function of these texts in the Exeter Book. Unlike CCCC 201, the Exeter Book has been copied by a single scribe, which makes such an examination both possible and of particular interest. Therefore, Section IV presents a full examination and analysis of textual division practice throughout the manuscript in order to contextualise the specific use of decoration and mixed majuscules found between JDayI, ResA and ResB. Where Section III has provided contextual evidence of a conceptual unit in the Exeter Book, Section IV provides manuscript evidence of such compilation and intention.
Section IV

Manuscript Evidence

4.1 *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB*: Compilation of a Conceptual Unit

As detailed previously, physical examination of the Exeter Book permitted a detailed consideration of *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB* in their immediate manuscript context. As a result, it became apparent that the relationship between many poems in the Exeter Book, *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB* in particular, was more blurred than modern editions and anthologies would have us believe; the divisions between individual texts and sections of texts in other Old English poetical manuscripts is also ambiguous. Frantz/Bliss’ research (1976, discussed in Section II) demonstrated that attention to codicological and palaeographical information, alongside thematic interpretation can help resolve the disputed unity of a text. Furthermore, such an approach helps emphasise the influence of compilation and highlights the importance of inter-textual links in the analysis of a text or series of texts in a manuscript. As both Robinson (1989) and Caie (1994) point out, many Anglo-Saxon poems have no clear divisions to distinguish texts and most have no titles; indeed a number of poems originally understood as isolated works were seemingly intended to be read alongside their neighbours as a didactic unit, or are now believed to be one and the same poem when considered in their immediate manuscript environment.\(^{121}\)

In recent years, the realisation of the importance of considering Anglo-Saxon poems in their manuscript context has grown significantly. Even so, the practice of dividing Anglo-Saxon poetical codices and editing their contents as isolated individual works is still the most accepted method of presenting Old English poetry in modern editions. Invariably this divorces texts from their manuscript surroundings. As Robinson (1989) explains,

---

121 Robinson (1989) and Caie (1994) both argue that *Exhortation to Christian Living* and *Summons to Prayer* in MS CCCC 201 are one and the same poem; Caie takes this further arguing that these poems function as a unit along with *Judgement Day II*, which precedes them and *The Lord’s Prayer II* and *Gloria I* which follow them in the manuscript. See Section III: Contextual Evidence for further discussion of this manuscript and the compilation of these poems.
In their manuscript context, [Anglo-Saxon] poems seem integrated with the surrounding flow of texts, and that integration is lost when the poem is abstracted by the scholarly editor from its place on the manuscript page and presented as an isolated artefact in the modern printed edition [...] this loss can seriously impair our understanding of an Old English poem. (1989: 193)

Modern editors present Old English poems in order to provide a more readily-navigable text for interpretation: abbreviations are often silently expanded; emendations to the text are not always made explicit; poetry is organised into neat lines and half lines; modern capitalisation and punctuation is provided. Often little reference is made to the condition of a poem in the manuscript where evidence of lost folios, parchment damage, capitalisation and decoration of the script is consigned to a footnote to the text, if included at all. The modern edition presents a ‘clean’ text, uncluttered by textual or critical apparatus – for good reason, guided by the supposed requirements of the intended readership – and yet this information can be most essential in interpreting a text. As Caie argues:

Rarely is the feel of the manuscript context conveyed in the modern edition that frequently includes no facsimile or description of the items surrounding the chosen text [...] Old English editors ought to feel a responsibility to convey the context, both codicological and socio-historical, of the work they edit. (1994: 155)

The unity of a number of poems in the Exeter Book has been previously debated and this raises methodological questions when approaching seemingly individual texts from in the codex and preparing a subsequent edition. Manuscript evidence has proven to be crucial in establishing the form and function of particular texts, including ResA and ResB. In light of this, the following

---

122 Caie (1994) makes a similar statement: ‘The modern scholar who extracts a single work from an Anglo-Saxon manuscript to edit it is akin to the archaeologist who selects a single artefact from a composite site, cleans it, restores missing pieces, names it and presents it in a pristine modern setting as an isolated phenomenon.’ (1994: 155)

123 See, for example Muir (2000); Krapp and Dobbie (1936); Mackie (1934) *inter alia*; who each edit the Exeter Book in this way. For comparison of technique and manuscript, see Klaeber (1950, reprinted 2008) whose edition of *Beo* follows similar methods.

124 In the most recent edition of the Exeter Book by Muir (2000), the edited texts make little visual reference to manuscript layout; where manuscript evidence is deemed significant, such as the folio loss between l. 69 and l. 70 of *ResA* and *ResB*, details are provided in a note at the bottom of the page. It should be noted that Muir edits *ResA* and *ResB* as individual texts, and though reference is made to manuscript layout and textual division within the commentary section of the edition, no visual cues or in-text notes are given to distinguish between size and layout of *litterae notabiliiores* in the edited text of the manuscript itself.

125 *e.g.* ChrI-III, Husb, GuthA, GuthB, Wulf, ResA, ResB.
discussion will examine *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB* in their manuscript contexts and analyse their relationship to one another and to the rest of the manuscript. Palaeographical and codicological manuscript evidence will be examined and the methods of expressing textual hierarchy, division and subordination in the Exeter Book will be analysed.

4.2 *Litterae Notabiliores* and Mixed Majuscules in the Exeter Book

The scribe of the Exeter Book employs a model of textual division that uses *litterae notabiliores* of varied levels of decoration alongside sporadic use of mixed majuscules in order to distinguish new texts, or sections in texts, from one another throughout the manuscript. The scribe uses mixed majuscules in one of three ways:

1. to display the full opening manuscript line of a new text
2. to display half the opening manuscript line of a new text or subsection
3. to display either all or just the immediately proceeding letters of the opening word of a new text or subsection.

Each of these practices can be shown in the following examples:

![Figure 11: f. 14r. The Ascension (Christ II)](image)

*Littera notabilior* N, accompanied by complete first line of mixed majuscules.

---

126 Occasionally, as can be seen from Fig. 11, these mixed majuscules, usually square capitals, can be interspersed with minuscule or uncial letter-forms, usually E. Both forms of E are shown in Fig. 11.

127 The possibility must also be considered that the texts as they are presented in the Exeter Book take their layout, capitalisation, decoration and subordination from an exemplar, now lost. However, with a lack of any evidence to support this theory, it is important to analyse the evidence we do have from the manuscript to discover, what, if any, design is being employed in the layout of poems.
Throughout the manuscript, decoration of *litterae notabiliores* appears not to be deployed uniformly while the distribution of mixed majuscules seems also to vary (compare for example the decoration of *N* in Fig 11: f.14r, with that of *I* in Fig. 14: f.124v). It appears from an initial examination that the decoration practices displayed throughout the opening seventy-four folios tail off towards the close of the manuscript, giving the impression that less attention has been

---

128 The use of final punctuation and blank space appears also to vary from text to text; for further discussion see ‘Division Markers in JDayI and ResA’ below.
given to the decoration of *litterae notabiliores* in the latter half of the manuscript. However, such conclusions must be made with care and placed in the context of previous scholarship. The temptation to ascribe significance to apparent development or degeneration of the decoration of letter forms is potentially problematic as there remains the possibility with any manuscript that it may currently not be presented in the order in which it was originally bound.

The structure of the Exeter Book has long been a source of debate; Wanley (1705) and subsequently Thorpe (1842) describe the manuscript as being composed of ten books, in which *JDay* and *ResA* and *ResB* appear within ‘Liber X’. In a more recent study, Conner (1993: 110) suggests the codex was prepared in three booklets or ‘originally self-contained units’ each with its own history. His theory is based on Pamela Robinson’s features of booklet identification (1978: 232-33), which state that the occurrence of one or more of the features in a manuscript strongly suggest booklet composition. As Robinson explains, the following nine features are criteria applicable specifically to Anglo-Saxon manuscripts:

1. The beginning and end of a booklet always coincide with the beginning and end of a text or group of texts.
2. The dimensions of its leaves may differ from those of other parts of the manuscript. This phenomenon does not often occur because a binder has usually cropped all the leaves in a codex to a uniform size.
3. Its handwriting may differ; where its handwriting is contemporary with other handwriting in the manuscript, differences in habits in setting out text on the page may help to distinguish one booklet from others in the same volume.
4. Its style of decoration may differ.
5. It may have its own series of quire signatures.
6. Its outer pages may be soiled or rubbed.
7. Its number of leaves to a quire may differ from the number(s) in other parts of the manuscript.
8. A scribe may have had difficulty in fitting a text into the quire structure of a booklet and, consequently, have modified that structure. The booklet’s last gathering may be smaller than its preceding ones, because the scribe did not need a quire of the normal length to complete the text, or the gathering may have an extra leaf (or leaves) in order to accommodate the conclusion of the text.
9. The last page (or pages) of a booklet may have been left blank because the text did not fill the booklet. A booklet in which the concluding text is complete may lack its last leaf (or leaves), suggesting that a blank end leaf (or leaves) has been cut away when the booklet was bound up with others. Sometimes text has been added on an originally blank end leaf (or leaves).
Conner accepts that features 1, 4, 5, 7 and 9 yield no positive result in regard to the Exeter Book; however, he states that three of Robinson’s booklet features, namely 2, 3 and 6, can be traced in the manuscript and subsequently identifies three booklets:

I: f.53r-97v (quires VII – XIII)
II: f.98r-130v (quires XIII – XVII)
III: f.8r-52v (quires I-VI)\textsuperscript{129}

Furthermore, he argues that the scribe composed these booklets in an order different from current compilation, basing his theory upon the rendering of the enlarged initials, especially the \textit{litterae notabili}ores \textbf{D}, and the supposed marked difference in skill used in rendering these \textit{litterae notabili}ores between the three booklets; compare for example what Conner terms ‘the skill’ of \textbf{D} on f.51v versus the ‘heavy-handed ornamentation’ of f.58v:

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{fig15}\hfill\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{fig16}
\caption{Figure 15: f.51v Figure 16: f.58v \textit{Skill vs. heavy-handed ornamentation of \textbf{D}.}}
\end{figure}

This theory obviously implies serious implications for any study encompassing the size, decoration and distribution of \textit{litterae notabili}ores in the manuscript. Certain studies have questioned Conner’s theory on the basis of the arrangement of the membrane. R. and F. Gameson (1995) argue that the suggestion that the three booklets were written in the order II - III - I is contradicted by the arrangement of the membrane. The parchment is mainly disposed in what they describe as the older ‘insular’ way: Hair-Flesh; Flesh-Hair (HF, FH), which, they suggest, means that the book was actually prepared in the order in which it is currently bound (see: also Muir 2000 and Brown 2001).

\textsuperscript{129} The final quire of the Exeter Book has been the subject of such critical attention, as it is the most defective in the manuscript; one folio is missing from the beginning and up to three from the end. See Muir (2000: 11), Förster (1933: 59-60), Conner (1993: 108-10).
Both Conner’s booklet theory and the current manuscript compilation indicate that *JDI* and *Res A* and *B* have been bound together not purely by chance; the three poems in question would all appear together in booklet II of Conner’s theory (ff.98r-130v; *Cant – Rid94*). Muir (2001) disagrees with Conner’s theory but fails to offer an alternative; it is important to note that to date no theory has been suggested to indicate that *JDayI*, *ResA* and *Res B* were ever compiled in a different sequence in the manuscript. The missing folio between *ResA* and *ResB* at Gathering XV (detailed in Section II) cannot therefore be linked to a conscious, structural division in the manuscript, but occurred after binding; it can be argued that these texts were always consecutive in the manuscript.

### 4.3 Sectional Divisions in other Manuscripts

Possibly as a result of Conner’s theory, the use and interpretation of sectional divisions in Old English poetical codices has recently received renewed critical attention, especially in regard to the numbered sections found in the *Beowulf* manuscript, MS Cotton Vitellius A.xv (see, for example, Owen-Crocker 2000, Fulk 2006, Kisor 2006). In his 1915 British Academy lecture, Bradley instigated an early explanation for the use of sectional divisions in Old English poetical manuscripts:

> the sections headed with Roman numerals in the [*Beowulf*] MS [...] represent the contents of the loose leaves or sheets of parchment on which the poem was written before it was transcribed into a regular codex [...] The loose leaves or sheets of the MS would of course require to be numbered, and the scrivener might quite naturally reproduce the numbering in his transcription, partly for his own convenience and perhaps partly to be able to show his patron that he had made no great omission or transpositions. (1915: 165)

---

130 See also Wanley (1705) and Thorpe (1842).
131 Though Muir (2000) also detects a similar theme at this point in the manuscript, he disputes Conner’s booklet theory and his argument for the rendering of initial *D* in particular, saying Conner uses evidence selectively, forcing it to support his theory. He argues: ‘[...] a comparison of any number of large initials in the first and third booklet shows the scribe using exactly the same decorative motifs as in the *eth* on f.58v [...] moreover, the *eth* on f.58v is executed much better than that on f.18r.’ (Muir 2000: 27).
132 Tables of results are included in the discussion below, and also in full in the Appendix to this thesis.
133 It should be noted here that Bradley’s lecture attempted to provide an explanation to numbered divisions in Old English poetical manuscripts, *Beowulf* in particular; however, his theory, now disproved, and subsequent work on sectional divisions, numbered or otherwise, is still pertinent to this discussion, despite the lack of numbered sections in the Exeter Book.
His theory has since been dismissed by Gollancz (1927), Timmer (1952) and Cavill (1985) among others, who argue instead that such sectional divisions in manuscripts – either by numbering as used throughout Beo, or litterae notabiliores and sigla as in the Exeter Book – derive not from scribal practice but from the poets themselves. Most importantly for the purposes of this study, Timmer comments: ‘the question of whether the division in sections goes back to the author of the poems is closely linked up with that of the purpose served by the sections’ (1952: 320). Cavill’s 1985 study examines sectional divisions across a range of Old English poetical manuscripts where many of the manuscripts examined (including the Exeter Book), show divisions are used rhetorically; therefore, according to Cavill, to ignore these divisions or omit them from a modern edition of an Anglo-Saxon text is to ignore one aspect of poetic structure consciously used by the poets (1985: 159).  

Division markers such as litterae notabiliores, decoration and mixed majuscules play an integral role in determining how we should interpret and divide individual texts, though their importance in manuscripts such as the Exeter Book is often not conveyed to the modern edition. As Roger Dahood (1988) explains in his study of initials and division markers in early versions of Ancrene Riwle, the rendering of litterae notabiliores in modern editions as modern, upper-case letters ‘give[s] an appearance of reproducing the situation of the letters in the manuscripts [and] sometimes alter crucial features of size and placement’ (1988: 80). Though the production of Ancrene Riwle manuscripts is some two centuries later than the Exeter Book, Dahood argues that the ‘proliferation of initials [in the manuscript] is but one indication of an ongoing effort ‘to make the text […] more accessible by carefully ordering it into manageable units’ (Dahood, 1988: 80); therefore, to neglect to include such information in a scholarly edition of a text overlooks interpretative evidence provided by the manuscript.

The litterae notabiliores in the Exeter Book divide the poems so that ‘for the most part, the [sub-] sectional divisions of the manuscript correspond closely to natural divisions of thought’ (Krapp/Dobbie, 1936: xvii). The litterae notabiliores are accompanied by final punctuation of

---

134 Cavill (1985) considers the following poems: GenA, GenB (ll. 6-13), Exo, Dan, Sat, And, El, ChrI, II, and III, GuthA and GuthB, Phoen, Jul, Beo and Jud.  
135 See also Cavill’s comment, p. 110 above.
the preceding text and the spacing given between texts and sections; together they divide and subdivide the manuscript. In this case, careful consideration of the size, decoration and place of each *litterae notabiliores*, alongside evidence of final punctuation and spacing in relation to the text are essential to understand how the Exeter Book poems and their subsequent divisions work together in the manuscript. In order to draw conclusions from the use of division markers throughout *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB*, the context of textual division and subordination in the manuscript as a whole must be examined. Here I analyse and categorise the decoration of *litterae notabiliores* used throughout the manuscript and consider the use and distribution of mixed majuscules. This practice is then compared with the use of division markers in *JDayI* and at the opening of *ResA*, and the relationship between these poems is subsequently re-evaluated. Additionally, final punctuation and spacing will be examined as further evidence of textual division.

4.4 Analysing Textual Division and Subordination in the Exeter Book

The Exeter Book contains 144 texts in total. Each text is distinguished from those around it by spacing, end punctuation, and most importantly via the use of *litterae notabiliores* that are rendered with varying degrees of decoration. In order to identify the role these initials play in the manuscript, specifically in *JDayI* and *ResA*, and the significance of the level of decoration, size and the number of mixed majuscules used, it is important to lay out the parameters of what is defined in this study by the terms ‘decoration’, ‘*littera notabilior*’ and ‘mixed majuscule’ respectively, and the variation which may occur in each of these categories.

4.4.1 Defining Terminology

The term *litterae notabiliores* follows the definition in Parkes (1993) and is used to refer to the enlarged capitals or initial letters found throughout the manuscript at the beginning of new texts as well as within individual texts, as currently edited. These letters may be rendered with or

---

136 *ResB* contains no *littera notabilior* as the folio containing the beginning of the manuscript is lost. See Section II: Thematic Evidence for further explanation of this folio loss and its significance.

137 Each individual *Riddle* is here classed as an individual text. For the purposes of this study, Muir’s edition of the Exeter Book (2000) will be used as it provides the most recent complete edition of the manuscript.
without decoration. ‘Decoration’ is defined in terms of the number of individual pen strokes used to render the *litterae notabilioren* of the manuscript. Decoration includes the presence of parallel lines within the form of a letter, as well as garnitures such as (semi-)circles, dots or flourishes which appear either along the ascender and/or descender of a letter and/or within the bows of letters such as a, b, c, d, e, g, h &c. Finally, the term ‘mixed majuscules’ refers to the letter forms which can follow a *littera notabilior*; these are larger than the main script of the text, but smaller than their corresponding *littera notabilior*, and often displayed in a square script (though rounded, uncial and minuscule letter variants can also be present). These mixed majuscules are used to display one or more of the remaining letters of the first word of a text, or to render the first full manuscript line of a new work (see, for example, Fig. 11. above).

4.4.2 Categorising Division Markers

Varying degrees of decoration, size of *litterae notabilioren* and mixed majuscules use are displayed throughout the Exeter Book. Excluding Leofric’s donation list (ff.1r-7v) – written in prose and bound with the manuscript at a later date – the remainder of the manuscript (f.8r ff) contains 175 individual *litterae notabilioren*. From this total I have identified four distinct categories, henceforth ‘Types’, of *litterae notabilioren*:

- **Type 1**: Large initials, rendered in black ink, decorated either by parallel lines or garnitures including (semi-) circular shapes, black dots and/or flourishes. Commonly a combination of these features. Accompanied by five or more mixed majuscules, typically either a full line of mixed majuscules, or a half line.

- **Type 2a**: Mid-sized initials, rendered in black ink, decorated either by parallel lines or garnitures including (semi-) circular shapes, black dots or flourishes. Commonly a combination of these features. Accompanied by up to four mixed majuscules.

- **Type 2b**: Mid-sized initials, rendered in black ink, decorated by a single line of white space found within the body of a letter accompanied with up to three mixed majuscules or none at all.

- **Type 3**: Undecorated initials, rendered in black ink, without any of the decoration found in Types 1 and 2, but accompanied either by up to two mixed majuscules or none at all.
The following figures provide visual examples of the categories described above:

Figure 17: Type 1. f.84v. *Widsith*
*Littera notabilior* \( \mathcal{P} \), decorated using parallel lines, semi-circular garnitures within the well of the letter, dots within these garnitures and a flourish at the base of the ascender, accompanied by a full line of square majuscules.

Figure 18: Type 2a. f.81v. *The Seafarer*
*Littera notabilior* \( \mathcal{M} \), decorated using parallel lines and a flourish at the base of the rounded bow, accompanied by two square majuscules.

Figure 19: Type 2b. f.112v. *Riddles 44-5*
*Litterae notabiliores* \( \mathcal{P} \) and \( \mathcal{I} \), rendered with parallel lines of ink running along the body of the letter, accompanied both with and without mixed majuscules.
Four levels of decoration have therefore been identified throughout the manuscript, with the quantity and variety of decoration, size of the *littera notabilior* and most importantly the number of mixed majuscules following this letter, each as significant, contributory factors to their visual impact on the page and therefore their individual categorisation. Type 2 is here divided into Type 2a and Type 2b categories; both display *litterae notabiliores* of roughly comparable size, but the level of decoration between Type 2a and Type 2b is distinct. The use of parallel lines as a decorative feature marks out Type 2b from Type 3 (more pen work has gone into the production of Type 2b letters than Type 3) while also differing Type 2b from Type 2a, where the *litterae notabiliores* display noticeably more work. Of the total 175 *litterae notabiliores*, 113 have been categorised as decorated, with 9 belonging to Type 1, 69 belonging to Type 2a, and 35 belonging to Type 2b, while 62 are undecorated and belong to Type 3. Each of the *litterae notabiliores* in Type 1 begin a new text as edited in the most recent edition of the manuscript (Muir 2000; Muir 2006); these texts are *ChrII* (f.14r), *ChrIII* (f.20v), *GuthA* (f.32v), *GuthB* (f.44v), *Phoen* (f.55v), *Jul* (f.65v), *Gifts* (f.77v), *Wid* (f.84v), *SoulII* (f.98r).

4.4.3 Visualising the Distribution of Types

In order to visualise the distribution of these Types across the individual poems of the Exeter Book, I here present a table which charts the various Types used in each text, the place of these *litterae notabiliores* in the text (i.e. whether they mark a new text or a division within a text as currently edited) and the number of mixed majuscules supplied alongside each *littera notabilior*. These results can be found in Appendix I. The table reveals a subtle structuring system in individual texts as well as revealing organisation of poems into five distinct Groups, each
characterised by the type of opening *litterae notabiliores*, the distribution of mixed majuscules and the length of the text. These five Groups are shown in Figure 21, below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP 1</th>
<th>GROUP 2</th>
<th>GROUP 3</th>
<th>GROUP 4</th>
<th>GROUP 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christ I (Advent Lyrics 1-12)</td>
<td>The Wanderer</td>
<td>Riddles 1-59</td>
<td>The Wife’s Lament</td>
<td>Riddles 61-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ II</td>
<td>God’s Gift to Humankind</td>
<td>Judgement Day I</td>
<td>Judgement Day I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ III</td>
<td>Precepts</td>
<td>Resignation A</td>
<td>Resignation A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guthlac A</td>
<td>The Seafarer</td>
<td>Resignation B</td>
<td>Resignation B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guthlac B</td>
<td>Vainglory</td>
<td>The Descent Into Hell</td>
<td>The Descent Into Hell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Canticles of the Three Youths</td>
<td>Widsith</td>
<td>Almsgiving</td>
<td>Almsgiving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Phoenix</td>
<td>The Fates of Mortals</td>
<td>Pharaoh</td>
<td>Pharaoh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliana</td>
<td>Maxims A</td>
<td>The Lord’s Prayer I</td>
<td>The Lord’s Prayer I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maxims B</td>
<td>Homiletic Fragment II</td>
<td>Homiletic Fragment II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maxims C</td>
<td>Riddle 30b</td>
<td>Riddle 30b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Order of the Word</td>
<td>Riddle 60b</td>
<td>Riddle 60b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Rimming Poem</td>
<td>The Husband’s Message</td>
<td>The Husband’s Message</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Panther</td>
<td>The Ruin</td>
<td>The Ruin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Whale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Partridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homiletic Fragment III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soul and Body II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riddles 1-59</td>
<td>Wulf and Eadwacer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 21: Groups of Texts in the Exeter Book.

4.4.4 Grouping the Exeter Book Poems

The first Group (Group 1: *Chri–Jul*, ff.8r-76r) comprise the longest poems in the manuscript and also contain the highest proportion of Type 1 *litterae notabiliores* and mixed majuscule distribution with six of the nine poems in this Group displaying a Type 1 initial at the opening of the text.  

Without exception, each poem in this Group also displays further *litterae notabiliores* that designate sectional divisions in individual texts. Group 2 (Wan–Wulf, ff.76v-101r) introduces poems that more commonly open with Type 2a decoration. Though one poem in this Group, *Wulf*, does not include any accompanying mixed majuscules alongside its opening initial, mixed majuscule use is noticeably much less here than Group 1; of the seventeen remaining texts of this Group, only three open with a Type 1 initial and a full manuscript line of mixed majuscules (*Gifts, Wid,* and *SoulIII*). The remaining fifteen texts have no more than four accompanying mixed majuscules. Of the total eighteen texts in Group 2, only *Deor* displays

---

138 *Cant* is the shortest text of this Group at almost 6 folios in length; the longest is *GuthA* at just over 24 folios. On average, the poems in this Group are 17.25 folios long.
initials that designate sectional divisions in the text. Groups 3 and 5 comprise the *Riddles* (Group 3: *Rid1*-59; Group 5: *Rid61*-94), which are significantly shorter texts than those found in Groups 1, 2 and 4, and which have a higher proportion of Type 2b and Type 3 opening decoration than the other Groups. The sectional division practices of these two Groups are not included in this present study as the *Riddles* differ in length, structure and form from the other texts in the manuscript. Group 4 is distinct from Groups 3 and 5 as it contains poems which are noticeably longer and different in structure than *Rid1*-59 which precede them, but are significantly shorter than the poems of Groups 1 and 2 of the Exeter Book with an average of 1.2 folios per poem in comparison with 2.75 folios of Group 2 and 17.31 folios of Group 1.

4.5 Results: *Litterae Notabiliores* and Type Distribution

Of the total number of decorated initials, 79 (Types 1 and 2a/b combined) are found to begin a new text while 34 are found within a poem and used to denote a subsection. 9 decorated Type 1 initials are used to denote the beginning of a new text compared with 37 of Type 2a, 33 of Type 2b and 47 of Type 3. Each of the Type 1 category initials used to denote a new poem is found in the first 36 texts, or 98 folios, of the manuscript, all before the introduction of the *Riddles* at f.101r, and all in Groups 1 and 2 as displayed in Fig. 21 (above). Type 2a/b and Type 3 initials, where they are used to denote a new text, have a reasonably even spread throughout the manuscript, though there is a greater increase in the number of Type 3 undecorated initials used – mainly to denote a new subsection – in the last 106 texts, or the final 3 Groups of texts as displayed in Fig. 21. This may well be due to the inclusion of the *Riddles* at this point in the manuscript.\(^{139}\) Due to the size and scope of this thesis, the present argument is focused on the size and decoration of *litterae notabiliores* and distribution of mixed majuscules in Groups 1, 2 and 4 of the Exeter Book only. The *Riddles* are henceforth excluded from this study as they are demonstrably different texts in both length and structure.

\(^{139}\) The most common littera notabilior found in the Exeter Book (of any Type, 1-3) is the letter I (51) followed by ð (20), þ (19) then H (16); the inclusion of ninety-four riddles in the manuscript accounts for the popularity of I, as the majority of the riddles begin with the first person singular pronoun.
4.5.1 Final Punctuation and Spacing throughout the Exeter Book

The visual division of poems and sections of poems in the manuscript also relies on the use of final punctuation (or *positura*)\(^{140}\) and spacing between texts. In his 2010 Manchester PhD thesis, Alger states:

> To date, there has not been a study that examines the continuity between poems and booklets in the Exeter Book and how individuals conceptualised and read the poems as an anthology […] The manuscript has commonly been scrutinised by taking poems out of their manuscript context and examining them as disparate texts (2010: 21).

His study examines the poems as they are presented in the manuscript through visual and verbal cues available to readers with a specific focus on the use of punctuation and unique formulae. His thesis convincingly shows how these visual cues direct the reading of, and provide allusions to, poems in the Exeter Book and can help find parallels between poems and booklets in the manuscript that scholars had so far overlooked. In particular, his thesis shows that the punctuation patterns examined illustrate that there appears to be some continuity maintained throughout the manuscript (Alger 2010: 21). What follows is my own analysis of final punctuation – *positura* – used throughout the Exeter Book, supported by evidence from Alger’s extensive study, which further supports the evidence for, and importance of, visual design in reading *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB* as a thematic unit.\(^ {141}\)

The foremost authority on the use of punctuation practices in Western manuscripts, Malcolm Parkes, defines *positura* (7 • 7 • , :•7 • , ••; ) as ‘originally a critical sign, or nota […] subsequently a punctuation symbol which indicated the end of a section of text’ (1992: 306).\(^ {142}\) He notes in particular that :• was employed by insular scribes at the end of a paragraph, in a

---

\(^{140}\) Not to be confused with the Latin name for punctuation *positurae*; in the Middle Ages the *punctus versus*, *punctus elevates* and *punctus interrogatives* were also known as *positurae* (see Parkes 1992: 35-40).

\(^{141}\) For details of other punctuation marks identified in the Exeter Book, see McGovern (1983) who classes dry-point vertical and oblique lines as additional punctuation.

\(^{142}\) Though it should be noted Parkes’ focus is primarily on Latin texts, his authority on the subject of punctuation has influenced the terms and definitions used in this thesis. For a detailed analysis of punctuation practices in the Exeter Book, see Alger (2010).
series of paragraphs and texts, to imply that some continuation was to be expected to complete this series (1992: 306). The most common forms of *positura* in the Exeter Book are:

\[ : \\
\quad 7 \\
\quad - \\
\quad * \]

These can be found combined in the Exeter Book in the following ways:

\[ :7 \\
\quad :7 \\
\quad ::7 \\
\quad :7 ::7 \\
\quad :7 :7 - \\
\quad :7 :7 ::7 \\
\quad :7 :7 :7 \\
\quad :7 :7 :7 :7 \\
\quad :7 :7 :7 :7 \\
\quad :7 :7 :7 :7 \\
\quad :7 :7 :7 \\
\quad :7 :7 \\
\quad :7 :7 \]

They can also include lexical signals thus:

\[ :- AMEN :7 \\
\quad :- FINIT :7 \]

Figure 22 details the distribution of final punctuation and spacing throughout the manuscript (see overleaf).

---

143 See also O’Brien O’Keeffe, whose monograph *Visible Song* provides the first record of all the punctuation marks to occur in the Exeter Book (1990: 188-9).

144 See: Advent Lyric 12 f.14r; Juliana f.76r; Sfr f.83r; HomFragII f.98r.

145 For further detail of the division of ChrI (or The Advent Lyrics), see Muir (2000: 43): ‘The openings of some of the lyrics (4, 7, 9, and 11) are visually set off from the preceding section by the special use of a combination of punctuation, spacing and capitalization. However, in the majority of cases (lyrics 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10 and 12) the scribe
Final punctuation in the manuscript is deployed quite uniformly throughout with the majority of the 40 texts in Groups 1, 2, and 4, using :7 to end a text or section of a text. Of the remaining combinations :7 is the second most common with sixteen occurrences, and :7 :7 the third with four occurrences. The combination • :7 or • :7 • occurs five times in total. There remain five combinations, each of which occurs once in the manuscript, which are as follows:

1. :7 :7 ChrII, l. 427, f.20v
2. :7 :7- Canticles, l. 191, f.55v
3. :7 :7 Phoenix, l.677, f.65v
4. :7 - AMEN Juliana, l.731, f.76r
5. :7 - FINIT HomFragIII, l.14, f.98r

The first four of these combinations (ChrII–Juliana) occur in Group 1 and the last in Group 2, suggesting that the punctuation practices in Group 4 are reasonably regular.

---

has not drawn any attention to the beginning of a new lyric. Naturally, nothing can be said about the beginning of the first lyric, which has been lost.’

146 The first combination • :7 occurs four times. The second combination • :7 • occurs once; I treat this as a variation of the first.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem</th>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Punctuation</th>
<th>Spacing</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advent Lyric 3</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>: . : .</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advent Lyric 6</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>: . : .</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advent Lyric 8</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>: . : .</td>
<td>½ last line blank</td>
<td>No blank line between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advent Lyric 10</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>: . : .</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advent Lyric 12</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>: . : .</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>: . : .</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : .</td>
<td>1 word on last line f. 17v</td>
<td>No blank line between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : .</td>
<td>half last line blank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : : .</td>
<td>2 blank lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>: . : .</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>1/3 blank line</td>
<td>No blank line between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>2/3 blank line</td>
<td>No blank line between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>2/3 blank line</td>
<td>No blank line between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>3 blank lines at bottom of folio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GuthA</td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>1 word on last line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>2 ½ words on line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>1 word on line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>1 word on line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>3 blank lines</td>
<td>one word at end of 1st blank line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GuthB</td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>½ blank line</td>
<td>No blank line between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>½ blank line</td>
<td>No blank line between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>3 blank lines</td>
<td>No blank line between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>1 word on line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cart</td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>½ blank line</td>
<td>No blank line between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>1 word on line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>½ blank line</td>
<td>No blank line between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>end of folio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>begins on new folio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>1 word on line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: .</td>
<td>: : : :</td>
<td>22 line folio/new folio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Punctuation and Spacing in Groups 1, 2 and 4 of the Exeter Book
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem</th>
<th>Fols</th>
<th>Punctuation</th>
<th>Spacing</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>1.104-5</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.224-5</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.344-5</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.463-4</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.606-7</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1/3 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final line</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>end of fols</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wane</td>
<td>1.115</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1 word on line</td>
<td>No blank line bwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precaps</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>End of fols</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seafarer</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yargory</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>2 words on line</td>
<td>1 blank line bwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wideth</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fales</td>
<td>1.198</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaximsA</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>2 words on line</td>
<td>No blank line bwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaximsB</td>
<td>1.191</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1/3 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaximsC</td>
<td>1.197</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1/3 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>2 words on line</td>
<td>No blank line bwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rining Poem</td>
<td>1.195</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>6 words on line</td>
<td>No blank line bwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panther</td>
<td>1.174</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whales</td>
<td>1.184</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partridge</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HomFrag</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1/3 blank line</td>
<td>2 full blank lines bwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEIR</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1 word on line</td>
<td>No blank line bwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1 word on line</td>
<td>No blank line bwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1/3 blank line</td>
<td>2 full blank lines bwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.214</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1/3 blank line</td>
<td>2 full blank lines bwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulf</td>
<td>1.191</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1 word on line</td>
<td>No blank line bwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>1.115</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1/3 blank line</td>
<td>2 full blank lines bwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDial</td>
<td>1.217</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1/3 blank line</td>
<td>2 full blank lines bwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoseA</td>
<td>1.216</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1/3 blank line</td>
<td>2 full blank lines bwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoseB</td>
<td>1.217</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1/3 blank line</td>
<td>2 full blank lines bwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descent</td>
<td>1.137</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1/3 blank line</td>
<td>2 full blank lines bwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almsgiving</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>1 word space at end line</td>
<td>No blank line bwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharaoh</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td>2 words on line</td>
<td>No blank line bwn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Punctuation and Spacing in Groups 1, 2 and 4 of the Exeter Book
Similarly, spacing is generally uniform between texts and sections of texts with a single blank line being used to demonstrate a division. More commonly towards the second half of the manuscript, the scribe has between one and six words from the previous text or section, which he incorporates into the blank dividing line by placing them at the right hand side of the line and marking the relationship of these words to the preceding text by an accompanying ‘wrap mark’\textsuperscript{147} thus:

![Figure 23: Wrap Mark (ChrIII l.460)](image)

If we apply Parkes’ definition of \textit{positura} to the distribution of this form in the poems of the Exeter Book, we can see that the form :- never appears alone at the end of a text, as currently edited, without an accompanying :7. The use of :- as the final component of the punctuation occurs five times in the manuscript: \textit{GuthA}, l. 169; \textit{GuthA}, l. 818; \textit{GuthB}, l. 157; \textit{Cant}, l. 191; and \textit{Deor}, l. 27. Again, the majority of these occurrences are in Group 1. Only two of these are at the end of a text rather than a section (\textit{GuthA}, l. 818 and \textit{Cant}, l. 191), where \textit{GuthA} is related in theme to the following text of \textit{GuthB}, and in \textit{Cant} it appears as a very small dash alone, which sits in the gutter of the folio and is almost obscured. The most striking use of punctuation and spacing combined is between the close of \textit{ChrII} and the opening of \textit{ChrIII} on f.20v, which appears thus:

\textsuperscript{147} This term is used by Muir (2000; 2006) in his edition of the manuscript.
Here we have two blank lines between the texts combined with four punctuation components completing the final line of ChrII. It is rivalled only in the size of spacing and the opening letters by Gifts, f.78r:

Muir (2000: 220) argues it is because the opening letters are so large that the folio only has 20 lines of text (rather than the traditional 22) which leads to the appearance of increased spacing between Wan and Gifts.
4.5.2 Textual Division and Subordination in the Exeter Book, Groups 1, 2 and 4

While a close analysis of division marker distribution across every poem of the Exeter Book is outwith the scope of this thesis, the practice of textual division throughout the manuscript is displayed in full in Appendix I. Individual sets of results (per poem, Group, or Type) are also included in the analysis below. These tables have then been used to identify suitable case studies that serve to provide a view of textual division at differing points in the manuscript. Fig. 21 (p. 115) displays the poems of the Exeter Book in three Groups, each Group categorized by poem length: Group 1: 10-24 folios; Group 2: 1-5 folios; and Group 4: from less than half a folio to 4.5 folios. The table demonstrates that there are three distinct Groups of poems, Groups 1, 2 and 4, (as outlined in Figure 21) which each display Group characteristics in terms of Type and frequency of subsections. As *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB* are located in Group 4, it seemed necessary to choose a case study text from this Group to show textual division in another text at this point in the manuscript, alongside case studies from Groups 1 and 2 nearer the beginning of the manuscript. Second, Appendix I shows the distribution of *litterae notabiliores* in each poem in Groups 1, 2 and 4, along with the various Types of *litterae notabiliores* used in each text in these Groups. It seems practical at this point to describe the results table before moving to an analysis of the results in their manuscript context; this analysis is then supported by four case studies to contextualise practice throughout the manuscript.

4.5.2.1 *Litterae Notabiliores* and Textual Division in Group 1

Appendix I shows that the longer poems of the manuscript are found in Group 1; these texts also display the largest number of *litterae notabiliores* per poem. *ChrIII* is the only poem in the manuscript to display examples from each identified Type of *litterae notabiliores* with the opening initial of Type 1, and a further two of Type 2a, two of Type 2b and two of Type 3. The only poem to include more *litterae notabiliores* than *ChrIII* is *Phoen*, though here Type 2b is not used and the poem is shorter than *ChrIII* by four folios. The remaining poems from this Group, *Chr* (Advent Lyrics), *ChrII* (Ascension), *GuthA*, *GuthB*, *Cant*, and *Jul* display a surprising uniformity in the distribution of Types across their *litterae notabiliores*: *ChrI* opens with a Type 1, followed by three Type 3 *litterae notabiliores*; *ChrII* opens with Type 1, followed by three Type 2a and one Type 3; *GuthA* opens with a Type 1, followed by a Type 3, and six Type 2a
litterae notabiliores; GuthB follows exactly the same pattern; Cant contains only two Type 2a litterae notabiliores; and Jul opens with a Type 1, followed with five Type 2a litterae notabiliores. An extract from Appendix I displaying these results is found overleaf.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POEM</th>
<th>FOLIOS Displaying Initials</th>
<th>TYPE 1</th>
<th>TYPE 2A</th>
<th>TYPE 2B</th>
<th>TYPE 3</th>
<th>OPENING INITIAL?</th>
<th>SUBSECTION?</th>
<th>No. OF MAJUSCULES</th>
<th>TOTAL INITIALS</th>
<th>TOTAL SUBSECTIONAL DIVISIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROUP ONE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChriI (Advent Lyrics 1-12)</td>
<td>f.5r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.10r</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.11r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.13r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChriII (Ascension)</td>
<td>f.14r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.15r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.16r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.18r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.19r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChriIII (Christ in Judgement)</td>
<td>f.20v</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.22r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.23r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.25v</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.27r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.28r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.30r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GuthA</td>
<td>f.32v</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.33v</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.35r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.36r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.38r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.40r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.41r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.43r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Litterae Notabiliae in Groups 1, 2 and 4 of the Exeter Book
In each case, the level of decoration used appears to indicate a structured textual hierarchy – the distribution of Types in the texts of this Group is not random, but rather remarkably uniform. Group 1 can be distinguished from Groups 2 and 4 as displaying the highest proportion of Type 1 initials; the subsectional litterae notabiliores consist of 2-7 initials per poem of a lower Type, 2a-3, which are uniformly arranged to decrease in Type throughout each text.ChrIII, GuthA and Phoen share similarities in structure: their opening initial (Type 1) is followed by a sub-sectional Type 3 initial before reverting back to Type 2a, 2b and then 3 once more. Each of these Type 3 initials is also accompanied by one or more mixed majuscules. It therefore appears that the first sub-sectional division in these three poems is of a lower level of subordination than the remaining divisions and suggests a specific organisational structure by the manuscript compiler or scribe.

4.5.2.2 Litterae Notabiliores and Textual Division in Group 2
Group 2 contains slightly shorter poems compared with Group 1, from Wan to Wulf. Here the only poem to include more than one littera notabilior is Deor, found at the end of the Group. The remaining eighteen poems of this Group are distinguished from one another by their opening littera notabilior and contain no other sub-sectional initials. This, combined with their reduced length, distinguishes them from Group 1. An abbreviated version of Appendix I displaying this Group is found overleaf.

Only three poems in this Group display opening decoration of the Type 1 category. These are Gifts, Widsith and SoulII. These are the last three poems in the manuscript to use this Type as none of the poems in Group 4, or in either of the Groups of Riddles, utilize this Type of decoration. The distribution of decoration Type in Deor is even more noticeably uniform than the poems of Group 1, alternating between Type 2a and Type 3 throughout; only the opening littera notabilior is accompanied by a majuscule, distinguishing it from the remaining litterae notabiliores in the poem.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP TWO</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wanderer</td>
<td>f.76r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts d' Men</td>
<td>f.78r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precepts</td>
<td>f.80r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seafarer</td>
<td>f.91v</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vainglory</td>
<td>f.83r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widsith</td>
<td>f.94v</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fates</td>
<td>f.87r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxims I</td>
<td>f.88v</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxims II</td>
<td>f.90r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxims III</td>
<td>f.91r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of the World</td>
<td>f.92v</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimming Poem</td>
<td>f.93v</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panther</td>
<td>f.95v</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whale</td>
<td>f.96v</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partridge</td>
<td>f.97v</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soul and Body II</td>
<td>f.98r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear

- f.100r | • |  | Y | 1 |
- f.100r | • |  | Y |
- f.100r | • |  | Y |
- f.100r | • |  | Y |
- f.100r | • |  | Y |
- f.100r | • |  | Y |
- f.100r | • |  | Y |

Wulf

- f.100r | • |  | Y | 0 |

Litterae Notabiliere in Groups 1, 2 and 4 of the Exeter Book
4.5.2.3 Litterae Notabiliores and Textual Division in Group 4

Group 4 is also characterised by the level of decoration used and the length of the texts; this Group is further distinct as it is found between Groups 3 (Rid1-59) and Group 5 (Rid61-94). Group 4, comprising ten poems, has the most prominent use of Type 3 as an opening decoration, though only four poems in total, ResA, Phar, LPrI and Husb, use this Type.\footnote{As noted above, the distribution of types throughout the Exeter Book Riddles has been omitted from the present discussion.} Three poems use Type 2a as their opening decoration, JDayI, Desc, and Ruin, while three use Type 2b, Wife, Alms, HomFrII. No Type 1 decoration is used in this Group. Only two poems of the ten in this Group, as they are currently edited, include sub-sectional divisions: JDayI and Husb.\footnote{It will here be argued that the ResA littera notabilior is actually marking a sub-sectional unit within a thematic Group, which begins with JDayI.} The use of sub-sectional divisions in JDayI and Husb is therefore shown to be unusual at this point in the manuscript. An abbreviated version of Appendix I displaying this Group is found overleaf.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Four</th>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>JDayl</th>
<th>RsA</th>
<th>RsB</th>
<th>Desc</th>
<th>Ams</th>
<th>Phar</th>
<th>LPrI</th>
<th>HomFragII</th>
<th>Rd30b</th>
<th>Rd60</th>
<th>Husb</th>
<th>Ruin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.115r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f.123v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.115v</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.117v</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.117r</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Litterae Notabiliores in Groups 1, 2 and 4 of the Exeter Book**
4.5.2.4 Distribution of Type 3 Opening \textit{Litterae Notabiliores} in the Exeter Book

At this point, I refer back to the division markers found in \textit{JDayI} and \textit{ResA} as first detailed in Section III, and shown in Figure 28 above. To recap, \textit{JDayI} opens with a Type 2a initial and also features a Type 2a sectional division accompanied by two mixed majuscules; \textit{ResA} opens with a Type 3 initial and no mixed majuscules. If we argue that the Type 2a \textit{Ƿ} of \textit{JDayI} suggests a sectional division, then the Type 3 initial \textit{A} of \textit{ResA} is unusual as an opening \textit{littera notabilior}.

As discussed above, the manuscript displays almost double the number of decorated initials to undecorated initials; of these, 71\% of decorated initials begin a new text compared with 13\% of undecorated. Only seven poems of a total 50\footnote{This total here \textit{discounts} the \textit{Riddles} as previously explained.} open with an undecorated, Type 3 \textit{littera notabilior}. These are: \textit{Pan}, \textit{Whale}, \textit{Wulf}, \textit{ResA}, \textit{Phar}, \textit{LPri}, and \textit{Husb}. Of these seven texts, however, \textit{Pan} and \textit{Whale} are accompanied by square majuscules, whereas \textit{ResA} is not:

![Figure 29. Pan, l.1.](image)

![Figure 30. Whale, l.1.](image)

The opening Type 3 \textit{littera notabilior} of \textit{Phar} (Fig. 31, p. 134 below) differs from \textit{Pan} and \textit{Whale} in that it is rendered without mixed majuscules; in this respect it is comparable to the opening of \textit{ResA}. However \textit{Phar} is a very short text of only eight (edited) lines in length (compared with \textit{ResA}’s sixty-nine lines), which may account for the decoration Type and lack of majuscules:
The *littera notabilior* at the beginning of *LPrI* (Fig. 27) that follows *Phar* is seriously damaged; however, the letter is unlikely to have been undecorated given the evidence of the tip of an undecorated ascender that survives the damaged folio along with the space indicated for the initial by the surrounding surviving text. Additionally, the text is comparable to *Phar* in that it is a very short poem, of only eleven edited lines:

Subsequently, the only other texts of any length which begin with a Type 3 initial and no accompanying mixed majuscules are *Husb* (54 lines) and *Wulf* (19 lines):
According to Krapp/Dobbie (1936), the initial capitalisation, end punctuation and spacing of *Wulf* are ‘less than we find in the poems immediately preceding it in the manuscript, and are in fact no more extensive than the capitalisation, end punctuation and spacing which set off the Riddles of the Exeter Book from one another’ (1936: liv-lv). Indeed, early scholars unsurprisingly identified *Wulf* as the first of the *Riddles* as it is the last poem of Group 2 before the first of the *Riddles* begins; though the poem is double the length of *LPri* and *Phar*, it is still a relatively short text from the manuscript at only 19 lines of edited text in length; *ResA* is almost three times the length.

This leaves us with *Husb*: of the other six poems mentioned in this context, this poem is comparable in length to *Pan* and *Whale* (54 lines of edited text compared with 74 and 88 respectively), though unlike *Pan* and *Whale*, *Husb* does not display any accompanying mixed majuscules to its opening *littera notabilior*. What is of interest to this present discussion is that unlike *Pan* and *Whale*, *Husb* contains two further decorated Type 2a *litterae notabiliores*, *H* and *O* which appear to distinguish subsections of the text, much like the Type 2a *Ƿ* found in *JDayI*:

![Figure 35. *Husb*, l.13.](image)

![Figure 36. *Husb*, l.26.](image)
4.5.2.5 Contextualising Type 3 Distribution in the Exeter Book

If we consider the wider context of these initials in the Exeter Book, the initial Ƿ of JDayI and the initial A of ResA appear to function in a manner similar to those used in Husb, but also those used to denote subsections in ChrIII.\footnote{For further discussion of sectional divisions in Christ see Philip 1940: 906. For the purposes of this study, Christ as defined by Philip consists of Advent Lyrics (ChristI), Ascension (ChristII) and Christ in Judgement (ChristIII) as edited by Muir (2000; 2006).} If we compare the initials found in JDayI and ResA to those found in ChrIII, we can see the same hierarchy of decoration used in both to mark out new works and subsections alike (see also Figs. 28 and 26, above). The scribe’s method of indicating subdivisions in ChrIII is demonstrated by reproductions of characteristic examples as shown in Figs. 37-40 (below). As Philip notes in his study of the unity of ChrI-III: ‘Such features [of spacing, capitalisation and end-marking adopted by the scribe] are keys to his intention; like applications of them are tokens of likeness in purpose’ (1940: 907). The following examples show both Type 2a/b and Type 3 initials, each being used to denote subsections in a larger thematic unit:

![Figure 37. Nativity section at l.275, f.11v (ChrI)](image1)

![Figure 38. Ascension section at l.600, f.16v (ChrII)](image2)
4.6 Textual Division and Subordination in the Exeter Book: Four Case Studies

Though the full spreadsheet of results (Appendix I) shows textual division and subordination to be more structured throughout the manuscript than previously imagined, the relationship between text, division Type, and hierarchy is a complex one. Therefore, in order to contextualise the use of subsectional divisions discussed above alongside JDayI and ResA, four case studies in total are here included to allow for closer analysis of these complex components. Three case studies comprise Exeter Book texts which display a variety of litterae notabiliores from each of the Types 1-3 alongside evidence of final punctuation and spacing, and which contain a high level of textual division in relation to their respective Groups. The following three poems have been chosen as the first three case studies: ChrIII, Deor, and Husb. Each has been selected from a different Group (as in Fig. 21) and together represents a cross-sectional analysis of textual division and subordination throughout the manuscript. The fourth case study examines the

---

152 See for example, previous discussion of Conner’s booklet theory and the proven influence of punctuation on textual interpretation (Alger 2010).
153 To emphasise, Groups 3 and 5, the Exeter Book Riddles, have been discounted from the case studies and present discussion, as they are demonstrably more complex texts, both in layout and in literary structure.
opening decoration and layout of SoulII from the Exeter Book, as it exists in an extended version in the Vercelli Book as SoulI.

4.6.1 Case Study I: Christ III

As discussed above, Group 1 (ChrI-Jul) is characterised by containing the longer poems in the manuscript, between 12 and 24 folios in length,\(^{154}\) and displays the most concentrated and fully realised examples of Type 1 decoration in the Exeter Book. ChrIII has been chosen from this Group as it is one of the longest poems at 24 folios (798 lines; GuthA exceeds it by only a quarter of a folio at 818 lines) and it displays seven examples of litterae notabiliores from each of the four Types described above (1, 2a, 2b, 3). GuthA is the longest poem from this Group but displays litterae notabiliores from Types 1, 2a and 3 only and so has here been excluded as a case study. Similarly, of the other poems in Group 1: ChrII demonstrates Types 1, 2a and 3 only across five litterae notabiliores; GuthB demonstrates Types 1 and 2 across seven litterae notabiliores; Phoenix includes one more littera notabilior than ChrIII (eight in total) but only demonstrates Types 1, 2a and 3; and Juliana only demonstrates Types 1 and 2 across six litterae notabiliores.

ChrIII (ff.20v-32v) concludes the Christ unit of the manuscript. Along with the other two poems that precede it, ChrI (Advent Lyrics) and ChrII, its textual and editorial history has been chequered, and the unity of all three poems has been hotly disputed for over a century (see, for example, Blackburn 1897, Cook 1900, Howard 1930, Krapp/Dobbie 1936, Shook 1961, and Luizza 1990). Recent editions of the manuscript edit the three poems individually (e.g. Muir 2000), but all indicate the thematic and critical relationship shared between them.\(^{155}\) Cook (1900) took the work to be a single poem and attributed it wholly to Cynewulf; subsequent scholarship has shown that though ChrI and ChrIII are certainly linked in theme to ChrII, only ChrII is

\(^{154}\) The only poem in this Group to have fewer folios than this is Cant which is five folios long (ff.53r-5v). However, a strip at the top of f.53r is missing and the opening decoration is Type 2a, which makes it the only poem in this Group not to open with Type 1 decoration.

\(^{155}\) For a detailed criticism of the editorial history of the divisions of ChrI, ChrII, ChrIII, GuthA and GuthB see Luizza (1990: 1-11).
attributable to Cynewulf by inclusion of his runic signature. The conclusion of ChrIII has also been debated; the section of text now edited as the prologue to GuthA was previously argued to conclude ChrIII that immediately precedes it in the manuscript (Howard 1930). As Dobbie (1934) notes, the lines of the prologue ‘might be added to the end of Christ without too great violence to logical continuity, though they would form something of an anticlimax for that poem’ (1934: xxx). Caie (1976) takes ChrIII to be lines 867-1664, basing his decision on the manuscript divisions, litterae notabiliores and spacing found between ChrIII and GuthA and in doing so reflects the more modern trend in editing these two poems; the most recent edition (Muir 2000) also identifies the same lines of text as ChrIII, and places the ‘prologue’ firmly with the beginning of GuthA. As with JDayI, ChrIII has been criticised for its repetitions and inconsistencies (Greenfield 1965 (repr. 1996): 131), despite revealing varied and complex internal structures that indicate these repetitions are used thematically and rhetorically to aid the poet’s central didactic aim. Unlike JDayI, the poem has a Latin source, Apparebit repentina dies magna Domini, which the poet uses as his basic poetic framework (see Caie 1976); as Caie continues, the identification of a source text for ChrIII points to the poem being an individual text, composed separately from ChrI and ChrII. This also accounts for the supposed repetitions and inconsistencies identified in the text; the poem expands a basic 46-line Latin hymn into a poem more than twenty-times the length. Luizza, referring to the importance of manuscript evidence, states:

One important witness testifies against the unity of Christ [i.e. ChrI, ChrII and ChrIII] and for the integrity of the opening of Guthlac: the manuscript itself. This evidence is summarized by Krapp-Dobbie and most forcefully presented by brother Augustine Philip. The pattern of capitalization in the manuscript […] seems clearly and consistently to indicate larger and smaller divisions of texts […] all of which is taken as incontrovertible evidence that the scribe, at least, knew where a text began and ended. (Luizza 1990: 3, citing Krapp/Dobbie 1936: xxv-xxvii and Philip 1940: 903-09)

---

156 For a discussion of the argument that ChrIII has its origins in insular homilies, see Biggs (1989/90: 35-51).
157 In an early article on the text (1929), Rudolph Willard argues for a link between VercHomVIII and ChrIII, stating that both have independently derived from St. Caesarius Ego te, O homo, with the dramatic address of Christ to the sinner at their centre. For discussion of links between JDayI, ResAand ResB to the Vercelli homilies, see Section III: Contextual Evidence.
Luizza here refers to Philip who states,

The Exeter scribe was more careful and consistent than the scribes of either the Junius or Vercelli MSS in his use of capitals and terminal signs [...] the Exeter scribe regarded the first three pieces [ChrI-III] [...] as independent poems. [Of the hypothetical combination of all three into one poem] the MS itself affords not the slightest evidence. (Philip 1940: 909)

However, as Luizza goes on to say, ‘the evidence of the manuscript is not unequivocal; one is forced to return to the poems themselves to determine their relation to one another’ (1990: 4). ChrIII is the longest of the three poems (ChrI-III), beginning by describing the events of Doomsday before moving to the central focus of the poem, Christ’s address to the sinner from the cross and finally concluding that man should ever live in the light – a sentiment not too far removed from those found at the close of JDayI and ResB. In terms of its thematic similarities to other so-named ‘Judgement Day’ poems, of which JDayI was traditionally classified as one, ChrIII is closer to JDayII in content. Though it does not share the same authorship, ChrIII also shares similarities in theme to ChrII where the conclusion also describes the events of Doomsday, providing a conceptual link to the text of ChrIII which follows. As with JDayI, ResA and ResB, the three poems at the beginning of the manuscript can be read as a thematic unit, in which each develops the theme of the last, from Advent to Doomsday. The iconographic evidence found in ChrII detailing the Ascension, and ChrIII detailing the Judgement further links these texts in theme, and emphasises the connection of Easter to Doomsday (also echoed between JDayI and HomFrII).

ChrIII details the concluding events of the Christ unit, containing descriptions of the Last Judgement. The twenty-four folios of the text contain seven litterae notabiliores in total, six of which denote subsections throughout the text; the deployment of final punctuation and spacing is also uniform throughout (see Appendix I). The opening of the text is signified by a Type 1 ð and accompanied by eleven mixed majuscules that fill almost the entirety of the opening manuscript line of the poem. The poem is clearly distinguished from ChrII that precedes it by double line spacing between the poems and clear end punctuation:
At its close, *ChrIII* is clearly distinguished from *GuthA* via the same deployment of spacing and punctuation:

The *litterae notabiliores* used in the text, including the opening ð, are distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Littera Notabilior</th>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>f.20v</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>f.22r</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>f.23v</td>
<td>2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>f.25v</td>
<td>2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>f.27r</td>
<td>2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>f.28r</td>
<td>2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>f.30r</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 43: *Litterae Notabiliores* and Textual Division in *ChrIII*. 
Using the *litterae notabiliores* Types as a guide, we can identify two main groupings in the poem: the first ff.20v-23r, Type 1 and Type 3; the second ff.23r-30r, Type 2a, 2b and 3. The distinction between the two comes at f.23r where we see a move from a Type 3 to a Type 2a. If Type were to be interpreted as indicative of textual hierarchy, then the Type 2a initial marks a more significant sectional division than the Type 3 that precedes it. If we were to further visualise this structure, Type 1 and 3 can be understood together as an initial unit, followed by the Type 2a initials, the Type 2b initials and the Type 3 initials as so:

Type 1: ll. 1-105

↔ Type 3: ll. 106-214

↔ Type 2a: ll. 215-332

↔ Type 2a: ll. 333-460

↔ Type 2b: ll. 461-561

↔ Type 2b: ll. 562-663

↔ Type 3: ll. 664-798

Figure 44: Subordination in ChrIII.

When we relate this structure back to the text, we find that ll. 1-105, headed by a Type 1, introduces the Parousia, the second coming of Christ in Judgement, while ll. 106-215, headed by a Type 3, expands upon this by detailing the signs of the Apocalypse, the joining together of soul and body, and the fates of the pure souls at Judgement;¹⁵⁸ in doing so these two sections together outline the subject of the text to come. Spacing and punctuation between these two sections is regular, in a full blank line and the common :7 final punctuation.

The first Type 2a initial marks out the beginning of a section, ll. 216-333, that details specifically the fate of the sinful souls at Judgement Day. This section is then marked from the next by another Type 2a initial which develops the description of the fates of the saved and the damned and a reminder that mankind was warned to think well upon this fate and to live in God’s glory on earth (ll. 333-460). Spacing and punctuation between the Type 3 and first Type 2a headed sections is again regular, though here the scribe runs onto the blank line between the two sections.

¹⁵⁸ For a discussion of the temporality of the events of Judgement as described by the poet in ChrIII, see Hill (1973: 233-42).
by one word; he marks this as belonging to the text above by use of a wrap mark. Final punctuation is once more :7. The spacing between the two Type 2a headed sections (l. 333/4) is less than previous displayed in ChrIII, with only a third of the line preceding the new section being left blank. However, combined with the :7 and the Type 2a initial, it is clear this is a new section of the poem.

The two Type 2b initials which follow then distinguish sections that describe God addressing first the saved and then the damned upon hearing their respective fates (ll. 461-561; 562-664). God then turns his address to mankind in general, and it is this account that spans the second Type 2b initial division; both God’s address to sinful and pure and his address to all mankind are an equal level to each other in the text, indicated by the same Type initial used in this subsection. The second Type 2b initial (l. 562) comes between God’s address detailing his coming to earth and the sufferings he experienced therein for the sake of mankind (ll. 548-62; 563-87). This second Type 2b section continues by detailing man’s ill deeds in the face of God’s sacrifices for mankind and concludes by directing the damned souls to hell. Both Type 2b headed sections are marked out with a blank line and in each the scribe runs on the final line of the previous section, marking this practice with wrap marks. Final punctuation, as previously, is via the use of :7. Finally, the Type 3 initial marks out the final section of ChrIII, ll. 664-798, which extends the detail of the fates of the pure and sinful souls introduced at the beginning of the poem. This section is further marked out by a full blank line spacing (the final line of the previous section does not need to run into the spacing) and again :7 is the final punctuation used.

Each littera notabilior marks out the relation of that section to a) the overall narrative and structure of the poem and b) its preceding and following sections; this argument mirrors Alger’s conclusions on the purpose of punctuation in the Exeter Book. Alger argues that ChrIII displays the highest use of anaphoric punctuation of the Exeter Book poems: that is to say, repetition of ðonne/þonne throughout the text, accompanied by • (punctus) to mark textual transitions in the poem. He explains,

The poem begins by describing the coming of the Day of Judgement. It describes how the people will be shocked with awe and surprise at its coming. This is punctuated by the large
display capitals at the beginning of the poem. The next punctuation mark signals the transition from the coming of the Day to a description of the coming of angels blowing trumpets awakening the dead, preparing all to be judged by God.

**DONNE** MID FERE fold/
buende semicla dæg meahhtum dryhtnes /
æt midre niht mægne bikhæmeð scure gesceaf/
te swa oft sceæpha fæcne þeof þriftlice þeon þystre /
fareð onsweartre niht sorglease hæleð semninga fort/
feðh slæpe gebundne eorlas ungearwe yfles genægeð swa /
onsyne beorg somod upcymeð mægen folc micel meotude /
getrywe beorht 7blipe himweorpð blæd gifen • **bonne** from /
feowerum foldan sceatum þam ytemestum eorþan rices /
englæ ælbeorhte onefen blawað byman onbrehtme /
beoða middan geard hrase under hæleþum hlydað /

(Alger 2010: 84; emphasis and transcription his)159

In his description of *ChrIII*, Alger argues that the opening display of mixed majuscules and the decorated *littera notabilior* act as a form of punctuation for the first anaphoric use of *ðonne*; this suggests that inclusion of *litterae notabiliores* throughout the text, and indeed other Old English poems served a more important function than traditional in-text punctuation such as the *punctus*. Therefore, each sectional division described here marks out something of significance; the use of *litterae notabiliores* draw more attention than simple use of a *punctus* and therefore the size and decoration (i.e. hierarchy) of these initials is important in understanding a text.

The Type 1 initial introduces the poet’s main concern and is followed by a Type 3 subordinate that further details the Parousia and the events that will happen therein. The first Type 2a initial marks out a section entirely devoted to detailing the damned souls at Judgement, while the following Type 2a provides further details of the fates of the pure and sinful; both of these sections are subordinate to the first, marked by a Type 1. Equally the following two sections headed by Type 2b initials are subordinate to the Type 2a as well as the Type 1; they detail how and why mankind has been judged and therefore relate back to the previous sections detailing the

---

159 Biggs (1989/90: 38) also discusses the *ðonne...bonne* construction in the opening lines of *ChrIII* and argues the repetition serves to ‘set-off’ each passage; I propose the use of *litterae notabiliores* serves a similar, more visually striking purpose.
fates of both pure and sinful, while also extending the detail outlined in the first section, in that they relate to the overall theme of the Parousia and Last Judgement. The final Type 3 is subordinate to the Type 2b initials, the Type 2a initials and the Type 1 as it further extends material which has gone before, rather than introducing an entirely new topic, or detailing a previously neglected element relating to the poem’s overall theme.

Additionally, the mixed majuscules which accompany these litterae notabiliiores contribute to this subordination of text: the poem begins, as stated above, with an almost full line of accompanying mixed majuscules, visually marking out the line as the beginning of a new poem. This practice indicates the status of this division compared with the litterae notabiliiores which follow throughout ChrIII marking subdivisions. The Type 3 initial has two mixed majuscules, but both are of reduced size for this context, only slightly larger than the main script. Compared with the Type 2a initial on f.23v, the mixed majuscules here are much more distinct, and at least twice the size of the main script. When we combine this evidence with the higher Type initial decoration used, this section is marked out as being further up the hierarchy than that which precedes it. The second Type 2a initial (f.25v) is accompanied by a single mixed majuscule; however, it is still larger in size than the two which accompany the Type 3 on f.22r, and so is visually of equal weight to the Type 2a section it follows. Both the Type 2b initials are accompanied by a square majuscule, though the first is more distinct than the second; the æ that follows the littera notabilior N is not as large as other mixed majuscules in this Group, or even in ChrII though it is larger than the main script.\textsuperscript{160} Finally, the Type 3 initial that marks out the final section of ChrIII, is accompanied by two majuscule letters, though the littera notabilior is 6mm smaller than the Type 2b of the previous section. Each majuscule is more distinct than those in the previous Type 2b section, though the smaller littera notabilior and lesser decoration still mark out the section as subordinate. Here the majuscules w and a complete the first word; this might be an influencing factor on the number of majuscules which accompany this initial. Spacing throughout the poem is also fairly uniform: sections are divided by a single blank line. On four occasions (f23v; f.27r; f.28v and f30r) the final line of the preceding section is placed on

\textsuperscript{160} It should be noted that the Type 2b initials used in these sections may be attributable to the fact that both begin with a littera notabilior N. In this case, proximity to one another in the manuscript, as well as text content may influence the level of decoration chosen.
this blank line, to the right, along with a wrap mark. This indicates traditional spacing (1 blank line between sections) was planned:

![Image](image-url)

Figure 45: *ChrIII* f.27r. Type 2b initial, spacing and wrap mark\(^{161}\)

In this respect, *ChrIII* displays a textual hierarchy through use of decoration and size of *litterae notabiliores* and use of mixed majuscules and spacing; this in turn is reflected in the literary structure of the poem. The use of different Types of textual division also reflects my argument for *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB* (see discussion at the close of this section).

4.6.2 Case Study II: *Deor*

*Deor* is found in Group 2 of the manuscript, f.100r-v; as one of the shorter poems of the manuscript (at 42 lines of edited text), it is divided across the two manuscript pages by a series of six *litterae notabiliores* of either Type 2a to Type 3 decoration. *Deor* is the only poem in Group 2 to use subsectional divisions; the other poems in Group 2 contain an opening *littera notabilior* only and have no sub-sectional divisions. It has been included here as a case study because the frequency of *litterae notabiliores* across the poem as a whole is much greater, not only for Group 2, but for the Exeter Book more generally – the poem has six *litterae notabiliores* over two folios compared with *ChrIII* which displays seven *litterae notabiliores* over twenty-four folios. Additionally, it displays one of the widest ranges of final punctuation practice across any of the Exeter Book poems with four combinations over two folios.\(^{162}\)

---

\(^{161}\) Only one subsection appears without the usual blank line: f.25v. Here the last half line of the previous section is blank; final punctuation appears as :7

\(^{162}\) See also: *GuthA* and *GuthB* with 3 combinations; *Phoen* and *Jul* with four combinations in Figure 22 above.
Each *littera notabilior* in *Deor* is separated from the next by no more than five lines of manuscript text (or seven lines of edited text), which again, marks the poem out in its Group and in the manuscript. The only other poem to have such a high frequency of *litterae notabiliiores* across so few folios is *Husb* (see Case Study III below). In *Deor*, only the first *littera notabilior* of the poem’s opening line is accompanied by a majuscule; to place this in context, in Group 1, where textual subordination is more common, only two *litterae notabiliiores* acting as a division marker in a poem are rendered *without* accompanying mixed majuscules. This indicates that both size of initial, level of decoration, and the presence and number of accompanying mixed majuscules contribute to the level of subordination the corresponding section of text is afforded in the whole, as discussed in reference to *ChrIII* above. In *Deor*, each subsequent *littera notabilior* marks out what can be described as six individual stanzas or units, each concluded by final punctuation, and all including the refrain: *Þæs ofereode, þisses swa mæg*, ‘that passed away; so may this’. Though the subject matter of each unit differs from the last (the final unit in particular), we can see that the visual division of the text corresponds closely to the textual division in the poem – the structure of the text itself and the visual hierarchy on the manuscript page therefore appear to work together. As mentioned above, *Deor* includes decoration from the Type 2a and Type 3 categories; the poem begins with a Type 2a initial, typical of Group 2, before alternating between Type 2a and Type 3 decorations for each subsequent stanza:

---

163 For literary interpretations of the poem, see, *inter alia*: Norman (1937) is concerned with the story of Mæthhild in particular; Biggs (1997), argues for *Deor* as a ‘blame poem’; Mandel (1977) interprets the stanzas as each displaying types of adversity the Lord can make to go away; Whitbread (1942) re-assesses the translation of ll.21-22 and further offers notes to the text (1947); Harris (1987) who concludes the refrain of the poem is derived from a traditional maxim associated with Solomon; Eliason (1965) examines the story of Mæthhild and Geat and uses the Theodric stanza to date the poem to 787; Malone (1942) focuses on the same stanza; Markland (1968) links the poem to Boethius’ *Consolation of Philosophy*; Bolton (1972), corrects and furthers Markland’s argument; Raffel (1972) critiques Bloomfield’s article on *Deor* (1964); Tuggle (1977) discusses stanzas three and four; and Condren (1981) examines the poetic technique used in the poem.
If the Type of *littera notabilior* used to distinguish each stanza indicates subordination in the text, we would expect each stanza that commences with a Type 3 initial to be subordinate to those beginning Type 2a. The first stanza alludes to the story of Welund, and begins with a Type 2a; this is followed by a Type 3 *littera notabilior* that marks a section of text referring to Beadohild and her subsequent plight. These two references, Welund and Beadohild, originate in the same story, and the Beadohild stanza can be seen as a continuation of the story from the stanza above.\footnote{164} As demonstrated in ChrIII, the higher Type *littera notabilior* introduces the main subject, while the subordinate Type marks out a section of text that extends the main subject matter. In *Deor* stanza two is therefore subordinate to stanza one, as a continuation of subject matter.

The next initial we find in *Deor* is another Type 2a where the third stanza introduces the story of Mæthild and Geat. The use of a Type 2a follows the argument of hierarchy and subordination as it marks the start of a stanza whose subject matter differs from the previous two, and is not subordinate to either; the Type 2a initial is equal to the Type 2a which begins the Welund stanza. However, the second use of a Type 3 initial is somewhat less clear. The Type 3 initial \( \text{D} \) marks the beginning of stanza four which appears to have nothing in common with Mæthild and Geat of stanza three; one possible link is that Theodric, the subject of stanza four, landed in Geatland and subsequently was killed there. However, this is also the only stanza not to recount a specific misery:

\footnote{164} See previous footnote.
Deodric ahte þritig wintra
Mæring burg þæt wæs monegum cuþ

[Theodric ruled for thirty years the city/fortress of the Merovingians; this was well known to many] (Deor ll.18-19)

Biggs (1997) argues that the inclusion of the Theodric stanza is to ‘introduce the theme of a ruler’s reputation surviving him in a positive way, but briefly enough that it does not change the poem’s tone’ (1997: 316). His article argues that Deor details a fictional scop who uses the poem to advertise that he ‘has not only the material but also the craft to make his lord as infamous as Nithad or Eormanric’ (1997: 320). It is possible that the subtleties of subject matter in this stanza are reflected in the visual layout; Mandel (1977) argues that, ‘the five exempla with which the poem begins identify some of the kinds of adversity that the Lord can make to pass away’ (1977: 7). Taking this argument further, the textual division in the poem could show that just as the stanza of Welund details physical suffering, mirrored by the spiritual or mental suffering of Beadohild, so the third stanza, detailing the sorrow that can come from love (as reference to Mæthild and Geat) is mirrored by stanza four, of Theodric and the sorrow that comes from exile, or a good king separated from his people. Stanza five details ‘Eormanric’s subjects shackled with sorrows’ (Biggs 1997: 313) which can in turn be said to mirror the final stanza which details the poet’s own sorrows in relation to his lord; this structure therefore provides an explanation for the alternate use of Type 2a to Type 3 litterae notabiliores used throughout the poem.

What must be considered here is the possibility that external influence and conditions affected the visual layout of Deor. Visually, Deor is regimented by the alternating use of Type 2a and Type 3 litterae notabiliores. As Wells (1976) points out, most scholars engaged in the debate about sectional divisions in Old English manuscripts attribute the dividing of the text to the poets and any subsequent glitches as ‘due to scribal blunders’ and that the sections of longer texts originated in antecedent manuscripts now lost (1976: 1). Wells (1976) presents an argument that

---

165 Wells argues that only a dozen out of nearly two hundred breaks in the longer Old English poems damage logical continuity, and all are found in Beo, Gen or Exo of the Junius manuscript. As his article deals primarily with longer texts of this kind, the impact of his argument is reduced when applied to Deor at only two folios in length; nevertheless, his argument is an interesting one and must be considered.
the varied use of *litterae notabiliores* decoration, the alternation between minuscule and majuscule letterforms, in particular the varied distribution of Þ and Ð at the beginning of texts and subsections in longer Old English poems, might in fact be better attributed to the scribe moving sectional breaks forward or back in a text in order that he might create greater visual variety in the decorated letter used at the start of each new section.\footnote{This theory might well explain the alternation between Type that we find in *Deor*; further, it may also explain the variety of punctuation combinations at the end of each stanza. In the poem, the following punctuation practices can be seen:}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem</th>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Punctuation</th>
<th>Spacing</th>
<th>Wrap Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deor</td>
<td>l.7-8</td>
<td>Ð : Ð :7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.13-14</td>
<td>Ð : Ð :7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.17-18</td>
<td>Ð : Ð :7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.20-21</td>
<td>Ð : Ð :7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.27-28</td>
<td>Ð : Ð :7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>Ð : Ð :7</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td>X : 3 words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 47: Punctuation and Spacing in *Deor*, f.100r-v.

In *Deor*, the sectional divisions are logical, indicated both by the length of the section and the repeated refrain. However, the alternation between Type 2a and Type 3 *litterae notabiliores* may here be also influenced not just by textual hierarchy and subordination (which can be argued for all sections but stanza four, and perhaps stanza six) but also by the external influence of the scribe wishing to include more visual variety in the poem, rather than begin each stanza with the same level of decoration and conclude each with the same punctuation.

\footnote{Wells continues, citing Timmer (1952: 321-22) who observed that ‘the word most likely to begin a new unit of thought […] is pa; thus if all sections begin at logical places, a disproportionate number of initial letters would be *eths* or *thorns*’ (1976: 2). He continues that the inversion of *eth* for *thorn* found in large numbers throughout the longer Old English poems and poetic manuscripts (10:1 in *Beo*; 7:5 in *Gen*; 10:9 in the Vercelli Book; and 18:3 in the Exeter Book) is due to the difference in shape of lower case ð to upper case Ð whereas upper and lower case *thorn* differ in size only, not shape; further, no section beginning after an illogical break begins with an *eth* or *thorn* (1976: 2).}
However, further influences may have helped shape the layout of the poem. *Deor* is followed by *Wulf* in the manuscript which in turn sits beside the first Group of *Riddles*; as discussed previously, the poem was originally taken to be the first of the *Riddles*; it is also the only other Old English poem to contain the feature of a refrain.\(^{167}\)

Compared with *SouIII*, which precedes *Deor* in the Exeter Book, opens with Type 1 decoration more akin to decorative practice found in Group 1, and contains no sectional divisions, *Wulf* is closer to the *Riddles* in layout and decoration. Therefore, further to the possibility that the alternation between Type in *Deor* may be due in part to a need for visual variety, manuscript context may well also have played a role in the poem’s layout and design. As Malone argues,

> The poem makes a whole because its various sections are parallel in matter and manner and have a common theme – misfortune. More particularly, the formula of [...] repetition serves to bind the sections together as well as to hold them apart [...The] poet’s technique of division is striking enough, but its full significance appears only when the poem is looked at in the large. Then the greatness of the poet’s structural achievement becomes manifest: he made a series of strictly independent parts into a closely knit whole. (1942: 2)

In this respect, the practice of dividing texts found in the *Riddles* may have influenced the scribe in the variety of Type and final punctuation used when dividing *Deor*; he may well have believed the stanza structure of the poem indicated it was to be laid out as associated *Riddles*. Alternatively it can here be argued that literary structure affects visual layout, where each *littera notabilior* has a specific visual function in relation to the text, just as in *ChrIII*. This also supports my argument for *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB*, where the lack of decoration of the Type 3 A of *ResA* denotes a subsection in a unit, of which the two Type 2a initials (\(ô\) of l. 1 and \(ƿ\) of l. 80) of *JDayI* mark out the central topics of this unit.

### 4.6.3 Case Study III: *The Husband’s Message*

One poem in the manuscript that mirrors *Deor* closely in frequency of *litterae notabiliiores* over so few folios is *Husb*. Like *Deor*, the poem is found near the end of its Group (here Group 4) that contains poems *Wife to Ruin* (ff.115r-23v), and just before the introduction of the second Group

---

\(^{167}\) The refrain is an unusual feature of Old English poetry; Biggs (1997) notes that it is only found elsewhere in *Wulf* also of the Exeter Book and the following poem in the manuscript.
of Riddles (Group 5). If we reconsider Fig. 21 (above), we can see that Deor and Husb share very similar contexts in the manuscript: to clarify, Husb is the only other poem in the manuscript, alongside Deor, to display such a high frequency of litterae notabiliores, while also occurring as the second-to-last poem in their Group before the introduction of the two Groups of Riddles; consequently, they have both also had their integrity previously debated. Husb has undergone much scholarly debate as to its unity and form, being edited as a single poem along with Rid60 in earlier editions; Rid60, f.122b, is a seventeen-line text that has been argued constitutes the opening passage of Husb. In the introduction to Rid60, Krapp /Dobbie (1936) argue that the decision of editing Rid60 as the introductory lines to Husb must be placed with the individual editor and their own subjective judgement as the Riddles of the manuscript lack ‘definite stylistic features’ (1936: lix). However, Leslie (1968) argues,

The evidence of the subject matter and the points of reference of the last four lines [of Rid60], however, appear to preclude attachment of the passage to The Husband’s Message, whereas stylistic affinities with the riddles are both numerous and precise enough to justify it allocation to their number (1968: 451).

In a similar vein, Muir (2000) notes,

It is apparent that the two poems complement each other thematically (if Riddle 60 is solved as “rune stick”), but the present editors would argue that they were probably placed together in the manuscript by the anthologist for this very reason. (2000: 694)

The text of Husb, as edited today, opens with a first-person speaker, typical of the Riddles, and which may account for its editorial history. In the most recent edition of the Exeter Book (Muir 2000; 2006), Rid60 and Husb are edited as individual works. In this way, Husb shares something in common with ResA and ResB, where manuscript context and codicological evidence have led to uncertainty and eventually resolution of their textual integrity.

---


169 Leslie’s argument is supported by Klinck (1992) who also treats the poems as separate entities.

170 Muir goes on to comment on the association between Husb and Wife stating ‘The Husband’s Message and The Wife’s Lament are often treated as complementary by critics, as suggested by their editorial titles, but any relationship seems merely coincidental to the present editors -- the anthologist himself, it should be noted, did not associate them in compiling the manuscript.’ (2000: 694).
As mentioned above, *Husb* is found across f. 123rv of the manuscript, between *Rid60* and *Ruin*. The poem displays three *litterae notabiliores* (including the opening initial) that show decoration of Types 2a, 2b and 3:

![Figure 48: Husb f.123r. Litterae Notabiliores N (Type 3) and H (Type 2b)](image)

Unlike *ChrIII* and *Deor*, (or *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB*), *Husb* displays *litterae notabiliores* that appear to move up the textual hierarchy: a Type 3 initial opens the poem, followed by Type 2b and concluded by Type 2a; the punctuation is uniform throughout, however as :7. The *littera notabiliores* of *Ruin* that follow *Husb* is a Type 2a, and that of *Rid60* that precedes it is Type 2b. In this case, if the poem is considered as it is edited today, there seems to be a reverse display of textual hierarchy, thus:

![Figure 49: Husb f.123v. Littera Notabilior O (Type 2a)](image)
In the introduction to his edition of the poem, Leslie explains that the presence of five runes at the poem’s close may well have led the scribe to believe he was dealing with another riddle-like text which led him to divide Rid30b, Rid60, Husb and Ruin as he does the riddles in Groups 3 and 5 (Leslie 1961: 17); the presence of Rid30b and Rid60 before Husb along with those after Ruin may therefore have influenced the visual form of Husb on the manuscript page. Leslie continues that the second and third lines of Husb are reminiscent of the riddle technique, referencing the upbringing and origins of the speaker; further, that the second section has a ‘superficial balance in theme to Rid30b and Rid60 and to the first section [of the poem and] may have served to confirm a transcriber in the view that he had to do with a series of tree or plant riddles’ (1961: 17-18) which in turn may have affected the visual layout of Husb in the Exeter Book.

If we consider Leslie’s argument that the context of the manuscript led the scribe to set out these texts as riddles, we can see that the distribution of Type and size of these initials does indeed mirror the distribution of initials in the two Groups of riddles and explain the results found in these texts. It also lends credence somewhat to the practices found in previous editions that took Rid60 as the introduction to Husb, as visually Rid60 begins with a higher Type littera notabilior (Type 2b) than that at the beginning of Husb (Type 3). In light of Wells’ argument (1976) it is also interesting to note that of the three litterae notabiliores in Husb, N, H, and O, only O appears in the manuscript as a Type 2a initial; Type 3 is the predominant Type for N (3 Type 3

---

171 The second section (ll. 13-25) opens with reference to beam, l.13 and includes bearwe towards the end in l.23.

172 The initials in Husb range in size from N, Type 3, 13mm; H, Type 2b 30mm; O, Type 2a 18mm; those of Rid30 and Rid60 are I, Type 2a, 26mm and I, Type 2b, 27mm respectively and Ruin: P Type 2a, 25mm.
occurrences to 2 Type 2b), while the H is of the predominant, minuscule form. The H in Husb is only one of two occurrences of Type 2b H: of the total 11, 4 are Type 1, 5 are Type 2a, and 2 are Type 2b. In this respect, the scribe is employing similar decoration practices for these initials as he does elsewhere in the manuscript; his use of a Type 2b H here conforms to the dominant shape found elsewhere, but may be influenced in Type of decoration by the context of the surrounding litterae notabiliores.

Husb, therefore, presents something of an anomaly in terms of visual structure, though it still provides evidence that textual form is mirrored by visual form; given this, I agree with Leslie that the scribe appears to have thought these texts part of the Riddles and divided and decorated accordingly. Combined with evidence of textual division and subordination found in ChrIII and Deor, this manuscript evidence supports the argument that the manuscript compiler placed JDayI, ResA and ResB together to be read as a unit, and that their visual layout and division reflects this compilation.

4.6.4 Case Study IV: Soul and Body I and II

The text of ‘Soul and Body’ survives in both the Exeter Book and the Vercelli Book, and is therefore of particular relevance to the study of the transmission of texts and the discussion of manuscripts. While the previous three case studies examined the distribution of litterae notabiliores throughout three Exeter Book poems, SoulI (Vercelli) and SoulII (Exeter) provide us with the opportunity to examine the decoration and layout of the opening litterae notabiliar and mixed majuscules across two manuscripts containing the same text.

---

173 Minuscule H is the predominant form in the MS with 7 minuscule compared to 4 square majuscule.
174 The letter forms contained within the Riddles are excluded from these totals.
175 To avoid confusion, I refer to the poems as follows: SoulI (Exeter) and SoulII (Vercelli) in this Case Study.
176 For an up-to-date critical edition of the two poems, a diplomatic version of the extended Vercelli lines and extended commentary see Moffat (1990).
SoulII (Exeter) is found on ff.98r-100r and falls in Group 2 (between Part and Deor). The Exeter version details the damned Soul’s address to the Body only (121 lines of edited text), while SoulI (Vercelli) – ff.101v-103v – continues with the saved Soul’s address (166 lines of edited text). SoulIII (Exeter) contains no sectional divisions; SoulI (Vercelli) contains one, which falls between the two addresses (f.103r). Decoration of the opening *littera notabilior* H and the corresponding mixed majuscules in each manuscript are not similar; other than the insular shape of the H and the capitalisation of the remaining letters of the opening word, huru (l.1), the visual layout of the opening of the texts can be said to have little in common. The design of the poems’ opening line, and textual division in Vercelli, are as follows:

Figure 51: SoulII (Exeter) f.98r

[Image Removed]

Figure 52: SoulI (Vercelli) f.101v

[Image Removed]

Figure 53: SoulI (Vercelli) f.103r

Images of the Vercelli Book are taken from Sisam’s facsimile edition (1976). Permission is being sought to reproduce these folios in full.
In terms of the classification system proposed above for *litterae notabiliores* in the Exeter Book, the opening display in *SoulII* (Exeter) can be understood as a Type 1 initial: the H is more than four lines of text in height (including ascenders and descenders), is decorated, and is accompanied by a full line of mixed majuscules. Conversely, *SoulI* (Vercelli) displays far less decoration; corresponding decoration of this Type of undecorated textual opening in the Exeter Book would be classified as a Type 2b initial (four lines of text in height; little decoration; accompanied by three mixed majuscules). However, the *SoulI* (Vercelli) *littera notabilior* H must be considered in its own manuscript context; when done so, it can be seen as comparable in decoration and size to other opening *litterae notabiliores* found in the manuscript. Decoration of *litterae notabiliores* throughout the Vercelli Book in general, bar three texts, can be said to be even less than the Exeter Book. The Vercelli Book contains seven texts which display either a full opening line of mixed majuscules or a decorated *littera notabilior*. These texts are: *VercHomII; Andreas, VercHomXV, VercHomXVI; VercHomXIX, VercHomXX* and *VercHomXXI*. Only two of these texts (two of the homilies for Rogationtide, *VercHomXIX* and *VercHomXXI*) open with a decorated *littera notabilior* whose design includes zoomorphic detailing to the centre minim of the opening letter M and interlacing on the final minim, and both appear with corresponding mixed majuscules as so:

[Image Removed]
Figure 54: *VercHomXIX* (Vercelli) f. 106v

[Image Removed]
Figure 55: *VercHomXXI* (Vercelli) f.112r

178 These two homilies, along with *VercHomXX*, form a unit in the manuscript, linked not only by decoration but also by theme: they are presented as homilies for Rogationtide. *VercHomXX* opens with a full line of mixed majuscules, which in the context of the manuscript is visually striking, and serves to incorporate the homily into the
None of the other *litterae notabiliores* in the Vercelli Book is decorated. In comparison to practice elsewhere in that manuscript, therefore, the opening decoration and distribution of mixed majuscules in *SoulI* (Vercelli) is comparable to practice throughout. The only poetic text to open with a full line of mixed majuscules in the manuscript is *Andreas*. The remaining poetic texts (other than *SoulII*) – *Fates*, *El*, and *Dream* – open with similar (lack of) decorative practice to that found in *SoulI* (Vercelli). Therefore, decorative practice in *SoulII* (Vercelli) is not unusual in its manuscript context.

In his study of the punctuation found in the two versions of the ‘Soul and Body’ poem, Alger (2010: 110-21) shows that while 12 lines of the text agree (2010: 111-12), there is a divergence in punctuation patterns between the two texts. Alger concludes that each manuscript was therefore punctuated according to the needs of the reader. Textually, the poems also show evidence of divergence, though Moffat (1987) argues,

> The differences that exist between the two versions of the Old English Soul and Body are not substantial enough to justify their being treated as two separate poems [...] the two versions do result from manuscript transmission; that is, they derive from a common written exemplar (not, in all likelihood, the original) and any variation between them has taken place not in performance but on the page, the source of the variation presumably being the transcribers themselves. (1987: 1)

Moffat explains that the differences between the two texts indicate that the Exeter version displays more evidence of the original text (exemplar) than Vercelli; if either of the texts were influenced by an exemplar in terms of layout, therefore, one would expect it to be Exeter. One potential limitation to the argument outlined in this thesis could be that textual division and subordination, decoration and layout have been influenced by exemplars of each text. By organised set of these three homilies. For further discussion of their relevance to this thesis, see Section III: Contextual Evidence. For further discussion of the homilies as an organised set, see Scragg (1992: 310).

179 See ll. 9, 15, 22, 39, 46, 57, 64, 75, 95, 97, 105, and 116.

180 *SoulII* (Vercelli and *SoulII* (Exeter) are argued to have shared the same exemplar. Moffat writes: ‘the two versions [...] derive from a common written exemplar (not, in all likelihood, the original) and any variation between them has taken place not in performance but on the page, the source of the variation presumably being the transcribers themselves. (1987: 1) On the same subject, Orton says: ‘the texts of V and E [Vercelli and Exeter] correspond sufficiently closely to preclude any doubt that they represent the same original composition [...] the evidence [...] would suggest that a single written text is the ancestor of both the surviving witnesses.’ (1979: 173; 194)

181 Orton (1979) argues that *SoulI* (Vercelli) is closer to the common exemplar; his theory is now superseded by that of Moffat, detailed above.
comparing the visual design and layout of the two versions of ‘Soul and Body’ the potential issues of an exemplar’s influence on manuscript layout is both highlighted and subsequently reduced; decoration in both manuscripts fits the individual manuscript context of each poem. The differences in design of *litterae notabiliores* and mixed majuscules in *SoulI* (Vercelli) and *SoulII* (Exeter), combined with Alger’s evidence of varied internal punctuation practices influenced by the needs of the manuscript audience, supports an interpretation of the design and textual hierarchy of *litterae notabiliores* in the Exeter Book in its own right; evidence for the influence of individual poetic exemplars is not sufficient to affect the current argument.

The four case studies considered above were conducted to contextualise textual division and subordination found in the Exeter Book, and to examine the possible influence of exemplar manuscripts in determining the visual design of the manuscript. While the form of the text, and perhaps therefore an exemplar for each text, could be argued to affect where the texts are divided and subdivided, evidence from case study IV: *SoulI* and *II* suggests that the design and scribal realisation of these divisions are specific to the Exeter or Vercelli Books themselves: in the Exeter Book, the decoration of *litterae notabiliores* clearly displays a scribal repertoire which involves decorative lines to the body of the letter and basic flourishes to minims and ascenders/descenders. Where poems differ in terms of size of *litterae notabiliores* and number of corresponding mixed majuscules, they find common ground in the basic design of the decoration. Just as internal punctuation and anaphoric phrasing are significant to the interpretation of an individual text, so the size, level of decoration, and visual impact of mixed majuscules can be argued to work in a hierarchy and have significance on the interpretation of the Exeter Book texts.

4.7 Sectional Divisions Summary

As detailed previously in this section, Cavill (1985) provides statistics on sectional divisions that show the average section size found across the Old English poetic manuscripts. The number of lines, sections and average line count per section for each poem he considers in his study can be viewed in full in his table (1985: 157, reproduced as Appendix III). Here, the average line count
per section ranges from 74 (Beo) to 128.8 (Dan). In the poems considered in his study from the Exeter Book, the average line count is between 81 (GuthB) to 114 (ChrIII).

If we consider JDayI, ResA and ResB as a thematic unit, the division markers and initials in these poems fall at: l. 1 (the opening of JDayI); l. 58 (the P of JDayI); and l. 1 of ResA, so an average of 60 lines per sectional division. The total number of sections counted by Cavill in the poems studied from the Exeter Book range between 4 (ChrI) and 8 (Phoen). Though it should be noted once more that Cavill’s study considers only the longer poems of the Exeter Book (ChrI-III, GuthA, GuthB, Phoen and Jul, all from Group 1), we can here use his evidence to compare section length in the JDayI, ResA and ResB unit. There is a twenty-one line difference (i.e. one single side folio of text) between Cavill’s average of Exeter Book sections and the unit of JDayI, ResA and ResB. That the poems found in the latter part of the Exeter Book are shorter in length than those found at the start may account for this difference. Therefore, the average section length is not dissimilar to the start of the manuscript once length of text is considered; neither is it dissimilar to lower counts in other manuscripts, as detailed by Cavill.

4.8 Section IV: Conclusion

Section IV has provided evidence that the decoration and size of litterae notabiliores along with mixed majuscules distribution is indicative of the type of textual division being indicated in the manuscript. Very few poems in the manuscript open with a Type 3 littera notabilior without mixed majuscules as we find in ResA. Where Type 3 litterae notabiliores are found, their use can often be explained by possible influence from nearby Riddles. Where influence from the Riddles is not the case, the poems are either extremely short, or accompanied by mixed majuscules (see discussion of Pan, Whale, et al. above). ResA remains an anomaly. When ResA is considered as a section within a conceptual unit, the use of a Type 3 and no mixed majuscules is no longer problematic: the A of ResA marks out a poem which continues the theme set out by the two parts

---

182 The litterae notabiliores of JDayI and ResA are not considered in Cavill’s study.
183 This should also be understood alongside the fact that we have a folio of text missing, or a potential 44 manuscript lines of poetry, from the end of ResA and the beginning of ResB.
of *JDayI* (marked out by the ð at l. 1 and the þ of l. 80, *JDayI*) in much the same way as *Exhort* continues the unit opened by *JDayII* in CCCC 201. Similarly, the sectional divisions found in *ChrIII* of the Exeter Book echo the divisions between *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB*; this further supports the argument these three poems were laid out in the manuscript to reflect the compiler’s intention they were to be read as a unit.

This manuscript evidence, when considered alongside the contextual evidence of Section III, therefore supports the argument these poems constitute a conceptual unit. The critical review of *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB* in Section II argued that removing these texts from their manuscript context had affected their previous literary interpretation – not always to the benefit of the poems. By bringing together thematic, contextual and manuscript evidence, I have shown that there is much to be gained from examining the manuscript context of Old English poems and that such an approach can aid their interpretation. Section I of this thesis argued that Old English editors ought to feel a responsibility to convey the context, both codicological and socio-historical of the work they edit. This is, in effect, what this thesis has sought to offer, culminating in a transcription of the texts in Section V. The transcription of *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB* is designed to convey their manuscript context by presenting the transcription of the poems and facsimilie images of the manuscript, in order that each stage of the editing process, or abstraction of the text from manuscript to print, is conveyed to the reader.
Section V

Transcription of JDayI, ResA and ResB

5.1 Transcription Introduction

The purpose of Section V is to provide a diplomatic transcription of JDayI, ResA and ResB to accompany the argument above. First, information on the manuscript, its codicology, palaeography and layout is given before the transcription itself. Facsimile images of each folio are accompanied by a facing diplomatic transcription of the text. Codicological annotation arising from an examination of the manuscript is included as endnotes to the transcribed text.

5.1.1 Exeter Cathedral Library, MS 3501

The Exeter Book (Exeter Cathedral Library, MS 3501) is the largest and most famous of the four major extant anthologies of Anglo-Saxon poetry and by far the most varied in content. The manuscript was one of many donated to Exeter Cathedral by the first bishop of Exeter, Leofric (d. 1072), and is described by an inscription in the opening folios of the manuscript as: i mycel englisc boc be gehwilcum þingum on leoðwisan geworht (f.1v).

Krapp and Dobbie state:

that this volume was the Exeter Book, or Codex Exoniensis, or Liber Exoniensis, as it has been variously called, is hardly a matter of doubt [however] the ground of proof is limited to the fact that no other book is known to have been among Leofric’s donations to which the description in the list would apply. (1936: ix).

The inscription in the Exeter Book appears on one of seven folios that comprise Leofric’s donation list; these folios are not part of the original codex but belong instead to Cambridge University Library MS li. 2. 11. In the remaining folios of the manuscript proper we have no

---

184 This inscription exists in nine extant manuscripts including the Exeter Book. See Förster et al (1933: 11).
185 Cambridge University Library MS li. 2. 11 is a gospel book; the first seven folios of the Exeter Book were most likely removed from the Cambridge codex and bound with the Exeter Book when the former manuscript was given to Archbishop Parker in 1566. See Muir (2000: 3).
other indication that the book was ever part of these donations. What has been termed ‘the natural inference’ by previous editors is that the Exeter Book is this *mycel englisc boc*, and as such this has yet to be challenged; the manuscript has remained at Exeter since its donation.\(^{186}\)

5.1.2 Manuscript Composition

The Exeter Book is composed of seventeen gatherings in total, each containing between five and eight folios. Ten of these gatherings have missing folios and twelve poems in total are affected, though some are caused by the loss of a bifolium that account for gaps in two places in the manuscript.\(^{187}\) The affected poems are *ChrI, ChrII, GuthA, GuthB, Jul, HomFrII, Rid20, Rid40, Rid41, ResA* and *ResB*. The most significant loss in terms of this thesis is between ff.118-19 in gathering XV of the manuscript, between what we now understand to be *ResA* and *ResB*, where a single folio has been lost. According to Frantzen/Bliss (1976) on examination of the manuscript, it appears the corresponding leaf of the bifolium has been pasted into place; no parchment stub remains to suggest the folio was cut out and it appears to have been lost through wear and tear. As discussed previously, this loss has significant implications in the interpretation of what was previously considered a single poem with structural and thematic flaws. Further examination of thematic implications of this loss appears above in Section II: Thematic Evidence.

5.1.3 Parchment, Preparation and Measurements

Studies of the manuscript show that the parchment used has mainly been bound in the Insular way: HF FH (hair-flesh, flesh-hair).\(^{188}\) The parchment itself is described as being ‘that comparatively thin kind, usually employed by the Anglo-Saxons so that occasionally the writing

---

\(^{186}\) For further discussion of works also copied by the Exeter Book scribe, and arguments for the origin of the manuscript, see: Flower (1933) suggests a Crediton origin; Conner (1993) argues the manuscript was copied at Exeter and also discusses its relationship with other manuscripts; Gameson (1996; see also his 1995 review article of Conner) proposes a Glastonbury or Canterbury origin though concludes the origin is essentially still an unknown; Butler (2001) also argues for Glastonbury; Hill (1988) agrees originally with Flower the manuscript originated in Crediton, and later (1998) argues for Glastonbury. Hill concludes the same as Gameson: that despite suggestions, the origin is still unknown.

\(^{187}\) For an examination of the codicology of the Exeter Book manuscript, see, Flower (1933), Krapp/Dobbie (1936), Ker (1957), Conner (1993), Muir (2000), and for detail of folio loss and Gathering composition in *ResA* and *ResB* see Frantzen/Bliss (1976).

\(^{188}\) See previous footnote.
shines through from one page to the other’ (Chambers et al. 1933: 55) which, on examination of the manuscript, is certainly true. Each gathering is prepared in the same way, with four, folded bifolia, pricked along a vertical ruling and ruled horizontally. These rulings are quite deep and pierce the parchment on occasion. Double rulings mark off the boundaries of the writing space on either side and can still be seen to run fully top to bottom on a number of folios. The folios of *JDI* and *Res A* and *B*: measure 317x217mm on average compared with the rest of the manuscript which measures 310–320x217–225mm; the average text space of these folios measure 240x160mm, comparable with the rest of the manuscript; and each folio has 22 lines of text which again is also average (the manuscript has between 21–23 lines per page). Förster (1933: 55) notes that those folios with more lines per page appear at the beginning of the manuscript and those with fewer in the latter part; the number of lines on these particular folios therefore fits with Förster’s theory.

5.1.4 Damage
The manuscript suffers damage throughout to varying degrees, from deliberate cutting and stitching of the parchment through to accidental fire damage. The former appears most apparent in the first half of the manuscript; f.8 has suffered particularly. The main fire damage to the latter leaves of the manuscript occurs from f.118r onwards, therefore affecting the final folios of *Res A* and *Res B*. The damage is unfortunately not consigned simply to the margins and the damage worsens with each folio from this point to the end of the manuscript. Though the damage to *Res A* and *Res B* is not as severe as it is to *Desc* or *Ruin*, for example, text is still lost from *Res A* and *Res B* from f.118r-119v:

---

189 It appears f.8r has been: scored diagonally by a knife; stained in a ring-shaped mark in the lower third of f.8r by a dark substance which also extends down the left of the text space; and the parchment has also been stitched in a relatively crude repair on the bottom left of f.8r. The stain affects the manuscript until f.12v, obscuring the text to a lessening degree with each folio. The damage sustained to f.8r suggests the manuscript was unbound for a time and possibly used as a cutting board, which would explain the score marks and the extent of the soiled, rubbed damage.
The only other damage to either of the poems is found on f.117 where the defects could also be from fire damage, though to a significantly lesser degree; this damage is relatively small, found within the margin and has since been patched. It does not affect the reading of the text in any way. However, the damage has destroyed the lower half of the descender of the enlarged initial wynn on f. 117r (JDayI l. 80), the other side of the folio. This has since been patched:

---

190 For more information on the damage to the manuscript, see Manuscript Notes below.
5.1.5 Layout of Text

As detailed in full in Section II above, *JD*ay*I* begins on the lower third of f.115v, marked by an enlarged initial ð at the eighteenth line of the folio. The initial measures 24x25mm (or 2.5 lines of text in height) and sits half in the margin and half within the text space. The ð is decorated in a manner that matches previous scribal practice in the manuscript: the exterior strokes of the initial are thick lines while the interior lines are much thinner. Interior decoration occurs within the oval curves of the ð, consisting of two semi-circles with interior dots. The crossbow of the ð is also decorated at either end, extended into hollow triangles. The size of the initial, along with the decoration, indicates that this is clearly the beginning of a new text; the end of Wife is also clearly marked by final punctuation. A Chapter and Dean Exeter Cathedral Library stamp is also clear in red ink at the end of the first line of text of *JD*ay*I*.

The text of *JD*ay*I* continues until f.117r where final punctuation is used at the end of l. 8 of the folio. An enlarged initial Ƿ follows, decorated in the same manner as the ð on f.115v, and measures 42x20mm, or 4 lines of text in height. Again, the initial sits half in the margin and half in the text space; this indicates the initial was intended here and was not included as an afterthought, though we do not have the usual line break which designates the start of new poems.

---

167

---

191 For further discussion of the fire damage to Ƿ on f.117r, see discussion on Initials, below p. 173.
This initial is larger than that used at the beginning of *JDayI* and yet does not appear to signal the beginning of a new poetic work. Further, the next initial in the manuscript is at the beginning of *ResA*. As discussed in Section II, this enlarged initial A is unlike the ð and þ in that it is rendered undecorated, is considerably smaller, measuring 20x27mm and has been drawn almost entirely in the margin – hardly any indentation of text occurs to accommodate it. Until Mackie’s edition of the manuscript in 1934, the first line of *ResA* was understood to open a line later than is now edited, beginning: *Ahelpe min se halga dryhten* rather than *Age ælmihta god*; this half line was ignored by previous editors. See Section II above for a full examination and analysis of these *litterae notabiliores* and practice throughout the manuscript more generally.

5.1.6 Script

The poetical portions of the manuscript (ff.8–130) are written in a single hand that is largely uniform throughout, given the length of the manuscript (Krapp and Dobbie 1936: xiii). The hand of the manuscript is Anglo-Saxon Square minuscule (Ker 1957: 153) and the script is neat in appearance with wedges on ascenders and initial minims. The scribe employs flat-topped a (initial a of *anra* f.115v, l.20, *JDayI*) which has long been considered typical of Square minuscule (see Dumville (1987: 153)) though there is occasional use of half-uncial a that Roberts (2005: 60) suggests is an indication of the scribe’s calligraphic ambition (*womma* f.32v, l. 21 *GuthA*). However, no such half-uncial a appears in *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB*; flat-topped a dominates. The letters d and ð are carefully distinguished from one another (*stondeð* f.116r, l. 10, *JDayI*); the cross-stroke of ð protrudes firmly above the script line whereas the top stroke of d is rendered flat, round-backed and curves back across the letter. ð does not appear to be used word-initially unless as an enlarged capital (*ðæt* f.115v, l. 18, *JDayI*). The toe of h flicks to the right.

---

192 Mackie’s edition completed that of Gollancz (1895), originally intended to be three volumes. Only two editions were ultimately published. Alger (2010: 57) suggests that the third proposed volume might have contained notes to the edition.

193 See Section II, above, for further examination of textual division practices between *JDayI* and *ResA* and the Linguistic Notes, below, for investigation of this division and the viability of the word *Ahelp* said to originally begin *ResA*.

194 Dumville (1987: 153) points out that this form, once thought to be a singular defining characteristic of Anglo-Saxon Square minuscule, cannot form sufficient evidence or definition of a script type; many specimens of Square minuscule fail to have this form occurring consistently, or at all.
the insular form, rather than curving to the left (*hond* f.117r, l. 5). Long *i* may appear initially before other minims for clarity (*in* f.116v, l. 9 *JDayI*) where it extends above the usual height of the following minim but not to the full height of regular ascenders. Long *i* may also appear before *e* as an enlarged letter (*ic* f.118r, l. 8, *ResA*). Fine, hair-like strokes appear from the left of the cross-strokes on *g* and *t* (*tungla* f.118r, l. 2, *ResA*) while similar, thicker accent marks are also found throughout the manuscript, with ten found in *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB*; f.116v has the most accents marks of these three poems with five in total on the one folio. Accented words are: *ác* (f.116r); *á, tír, bréa, álætað*, *á* (f.116v); *árære, onstép* (f.117r); *ræd, hæl* (f.118v); *á* (f.119r); and *á* (f.119v).195 This folio also displays potential for confusion between accents and the hair-like strokes on *g* and *t*, for example in *tír* l.11 where the accent mark appears to be a continuation of the fine stroke from the cross-stroke of *t*. Roberts (2005: 60) suggests these are accent marks but on inspection of the manuscript this appears not to be the case. Krapp and Dobbie note that the Exeter Book as a whole contains over six hundred accent marks stating five-sixths of these occur over etymologically long vowels, though a number of other poems contain the use of an accent mark over an etymologically short vowel:196

![Image of Exeter Book text](image.png)

**Figure 59:** (*ác JDayI* l.20)

*r* and *s* appear as the long, Insular forms. *x* is rendered with a sweeping descender to the left. The scribe uses three forms of *y*: straight dotted (*yfles* f.116v, l. 4); the f-shaped form (*synna* f.119r, l. 6) and curved form, both without a dot (*hyst*, f.116r, l. 1) and dotted. The curved dotted form does not appear in *JDayI*, *ResA* or *ResB*; the scribe seems to prefer to dot straight *y* only by this

---

195 For a comprehensive table displaying the accent marks in the Exeter Book, see Krapp/Dobbie (1936: lxxii-lxxxviii). Their study also includes details of the small capitals used throughout the manuscript (1936: lxxvi-lxxx); the only word to use a small capital in *JDayI* is *in* (ll. 50 and 119) while in *ResA* and *ResB* they are: *in* (*ResA* ll. 40, 44; *ResB* l.6), *ic* (*ResA* ll. 5, 20, *ResB* l.26), *nu* (*ResA* l. 41), *is* (*ResB* ll. 21 and 40), and *wudu* (*ResB* l. 45).

stage in the manuscript. The Old English æ digraph is used as are þ and the runic form ᵀ (wynn).

Pointing is light throughout the manuscript; *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB* contain 31 mid-points in nine folios along with two sigla which denote the end of a section or poem. Krapp and Dobbie note that the use of the point in the manuscript is sporadic throughout and ‘could hardly have been intended to serve as a metrical punctuation such as we find in the Junius Manuscript’ (1936: xxi). These points are easily confused with the points the scribe places at the end of the upstroke in the letters t and a (oft f.115v, l. 20; *leahtra* f.117r, l. 5). The ends of poems or sections of poems are generally indicated by use of : 7 or : ~ or combinations of both. In *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB* : 7 is used.197

Square capitals, found in display script in English manuscripts from the late ninth century (Roberts 2005: 60), indicate the opening lines of poems or major new sections, though in the Exeter Book this practice occurs significantly infrequently in the latter half of the manuscript: *JDayI* begins with a single enlarged capital alone, as does *ResA* though we do find two square capitals following the enlarged initial þ half-way through *JDayI* (I and L f.117r, l. 9). There is, in line with the formal nature of the script, little abbreviation apart from the Tironian sign ᵀ for þ(æt); 7 for ond; and the tilde, or macron, over abbreviations such as: hi(m), yrþu(m):

![Figure 60: ᵀ (þæt) JDayI l. 69a](image)

![Figure 61: 7 (ond) ResA ll. 5a; 6b](image)

197 See Section IV: Manuscript Evidence for further discussion of end punctuation practices throughout the manuscript.
It is now widely held that the manuscript was the work of a single scribe, though Flower believed there to be more than one due to what he thought was ‘variety in quality’ of the script (1933: 83); however, he offers no evidence to support this opinion and Krapp and Dobbie (1936: xiii) refute his claims. Equally Sisam comments in his chapter on the Exeter Book that ‘even the authority of Mr. Flower will not persuade me that more than one scribe was employed’ (1953: 97). Sisam describes the copying of the manuscript as ‘mechanical’ stating that for example, words ‘such as *swist*, which is no word, [is] written three times for common *swift* (f.104v corrected, f.105r, f.128v)’ (1953: 98). He also posits that such mechanical copying of the Exeter Book, alongside the uniformity of the script throughout, suggests that the manuscript was copied from an exemplar. SoulII offers the opportunity for comparison as it is found on ff.98r-110r of the Exeter Book and also as SoulI in the Vercelli Book. For an examination of evidence the poem was copied from an exemplar, see Case Study IV in Section IV, above.

5.1.7 Initials

As detailed at length in Section IV, the Exeter Book scribe employs both enlarged initials (*litterae notabiliores*) and mixed majuscules in the manuscript to distinguish between the beginning of poems and subsequent sections. The initials are somewhat larger in the first half of the manuscript than the latter, extending through up to six lines of text compared with the average three or four lines; the first half of the manuscript also sees significantly more frequent

---

198 Sisam (1953: 97-108) states that it seems as though the collection was put together by tacking on new groups or items as codices or single pieces came to hand and that it is unlikely that the compilation was first made in the Exeter Book, whose stately, even style indicates that it was transcribed continuously from a collection already made.  
199 For further detailed examination and analysis of the textual division and subordination practices found throughout the Exeter Book, please see Section IV: Manuscript Evidence.
use of capitals which are utilised by the scribe in the entire opening line of new poems. In total, nine poems are subdivided into sections, similar to sectional divisions found in other Anglo-Saxon poetical manuscripts (Krapp/Dobbie 1936: xvii), and again they are indicated by *litterae notabiliores*, occasional capitalisation of the first word of the section, spacing and punctuation. In general, the scribe clearly distinguishes the close of a poem or section by final punctuation, alongside one half to two and a half blank lines. Again, as detailed in full in Section IV, the scribe marks out a sub-section by use of a *litterae notabilior* and by capitalising the remaining letters of first word. Conversely, towards the end of the manuscript, fuller capitalisation of the beginning of poems is abandoned by the scribe; the beginning of many poems is then distinguished by an enlarged initial alone, either decorated or not, and occasionally one or two following capitals.

*JDayI* and *ResA* fall into this latter category: *litterae notabiliores* are used at the beginning of the poems, following clear final punctuation of the previous poem and a blank half line at the first line of text. Neither of the enlarged initials of either poem is followed by a capital. *JDayI* opens on the lower third of f.115v, marked by an enlarged initial ð at the eighteenth line of the folio. The initial measures 24mm x 25mm or 2.5 lines of text in height and sits mostly in the margin with one third within the text space; as throughout the manuscript, the initial is in the ink of the text colour. The ð is decorated in a manner similar to previous scribal practice in the manuscript: the exterior strokes of the initial consist of thick lines while the interior lines are much thinner. Interior decoration occurs within the oval curves of the ð, consisting of two small semi-circles with central dots. The cross-stroke of the ð is also decorated at either end, extended into hollowed wedges. The size of the initial, along with the level of decoration, clearly indicates that this is the beginning of a new text and the end of *Wife* which precedes *JDayI* is also clearly marked by final punctuation. The text of *JDayI* continues until f.117r where final punctuation is used at the end of line 8 of the folio. An enlarged initial Ƿ follows, decorated in the same manner as the ð on f.115v, and measures 42mm x 20mm including descender, or 4 lines of text in height. The initial has been damaged at the base of the ascender; this most likely indicates the furthest reaches of the extensive fire damage we see to the latter folios of the manuscript.
By viewing the text imprint on the opposite folio, created before the fire damage obscured the $\mathbf{Ƿ}$, the descender of the initial may in fact be slightly longer than the measurements given above, perhaps by another 5mm or so, and decorated with a pointed tip. This ink imprint is not visible in the digitised facsimile, but is visible on examination of the manuscript folio itself. Similar decoration practice to that described from the imprint can be seen in the following images:

![Image 1](image1.png)  ![Image 2](image2.png)

*Figure 65: Decoration of $\mathbf{Ƿ}$*

The initial $\mathbf{Ƿ}$ at this point of *JDayI* (l. 80) differs in practice from the other *litterae notabiliiores* found within the three poems at the centre of this thesis. The mid two letters of the first word of this new section, *wile*, $\mathbf{I}$ and $\mathbf{L}$ are rendered as small capitals, each 7mm in height:

---

200 The manuscript is rather tightly bound at this point; the images here reproduced are done so with kind permission of Prof. Bernard J Muir who produced the 2006 digitised facsimile of the Exeter Book. The manuscript was not disbound in the production of that facsimile, resulting in the reduced visibility of the *littera notabilior* in this image.

201 See also the same initial on f.84v that has a curl to the tip of its descender and also that of f.100r; similar practice can be seen in lesser decorated initials such as f.112v.
However, we do not have the usual blank line(s) that designate the start of new poems in the Exeter Book; compare the blank half line at the beginning of \textit{JDayI} and \textit{ResA} for example:
Rather there is a quarter line of blank space at the end of the last line of the previous section. The initial here is also larger by a line and a half than the ð of JDayI or the A of ResA and yet has not been deemed by modern-day editors to signal the beginning of a new poetic work. As stated above, neither the ð of JDayI or the A of ResA are followed by capitals and yet these are the beginnings of new poetic works. Further, the next initial in the manuscript appears at the beginning of ResA. This enlarged initial A is unlike the ð and Þ as it is rendered undecorated and is also smaller than the Þ, measuring 20mm x 27mm, thus similar in size to the ð of JDayI.

Though the use of smaller capitals in the opening lines of new works is found to a lesser extent in the latter part of the Exeter Book, the level of decoration is uniform throughout; final punctuation is also consistently and clearly used by the scribe. The Þ of JDayI is therefore curious – the size and decoration of the initial indicates something either about its intended purpose in the text, some sort of scribal error or perhaps duplicated the layout of an exemplar, now lost. To this end, and due to the analysis of textual division and subordination detailed in Section II, the transcription of JDayI, ResA and ResB reflects the contention of this thesis that these texts were compiled to be read together. Though the ‘limitations or constraints of the codex’ (McGann 2001: 68) mean reproducing the manuscript exact in a print edition can be problematic, the availability of digitised manuscripts makes it more possible to view a facsimile of the folios side-by-side with a diplomatic transcription of the text. The subsequent transcription, below, is designed to convey each stage of abstraction of the text from manuscript to printed text. The transcribed text is laid out to convey the manuscript relationship between the three poems; litterae notabiliores are shown as enlarged capitals and mixed majuscules as regular capitals to reflect their function in the manuscript. The poems display two line-numbering practices: the original line numbering from editions that treat ResA and ResB as a unit, and the more modern practice of numbering of ResA and ResB and individual texts. The original numbering is shown within square parentheses in ResB. Full details of the editorial stance taken in producing this transcription follows.
5.1.8 Transcription Policy

Manuscript compilation is an important aspect of this study and subsequently this transcription sets out to correct previous codicological misrepresentation. The subsequent emphasis falls not only on the relationship of each individual text to the others in light of their order in the manuscript, but also on highlighting unconsidered manuscript information that directs us to a better understanding of how individual texts function together. Further, manuscript information that indicates potential textual division and subordination within these texts (and within the manuscript as a whole) is examined in detail and represented appropriately in the transcribed text.

*JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB* are therefore here presented as a diplomatic transcription of three separate works, connected to one another by manuscript context and theme, to show manuscript detail and idiosyncrasies of the text. Here abbreviations are shown expanded and underlined to display this expansion, missing or damaged text is indicated by ellipses, \( \mathbf{p} \) (wynn) is transcribed as \( w \) and the abbreviation 7 as \( \text{ond} \). Letters designated ‘small capitals’ by Krapp/Dobbie (1934), typically I, have been transcribed as lower case letters; their slightly enlarged appearance in the manuscript seems to be to avoid confusion with other minims rather than to designate capitalisation.202 Original manuscript punctuation such as *punctus elevatus* and stress marks are reproduced in the transcription. The enlarged, and sometimes decorated, initials are reproduced as emboldened capitals, for reasons explained previously. Accent marks found in the manuscript are reproduced in the transcription and scribal errors are retained so the reader may compare the transcription to the manuscript facsimile that appears on the facing page. Information of any emendations to the text (such as spelling etc.) by previous editors is provided in the Codicological Annotation to the transcription; these are organised by manuscript line number. *ResA* and *ResB* are transcribed as two separate, but thematically linked works, following the most influential scholarship of the poems (Frantzen/Bliss, 1976), and in accordance with codicological evidence and modern scholarship.203 The missing folio which separates the two poems from one another, is indicated by ellipses.

---

202 Full tables of frequency, distribution and further information regarding these small capitals can be found in Krapp/Dobbie (1936).
Transcription
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Codicological Annotation  196
judgment day i

178
[close of *Wife* ll. 30-53]

ðæt ge limpan sceal þætte ·
lagu floweð · flod ofer foldan feores bið ðæt ende
anra ge hwylcum oft mæg seþe wile inhis sylfes
sefan soð ge þencan hafað him ge þinged hider
þeoden user onþam mæstan dæge mægen cyninga
Judgement Day I  f.116r
hyhst wile þonne forbærnan brego mon cynnes lond mid 
lige nispæt lytulu spræc toge hæganne hat bið onhæled 
sippan fyr nimeð foldan sceatas byrnende lig beorhte 
ge sceafte bið eal þes ginna grund gleda gefylled re 
þra bronda swa nu rixiað gromhydge guman gylpe¹ 
strynað hyra hlaforde gehlæges tilgað oþþæt hybe 
swicað synna weardes þæt hi mið þy heape helle secæð 
fleogað midþam feondum himbiþ fyr ongean drof 
lic wite þær næfre² dæg scineð³ leohte oflyfte ác abi 
locen stondeð sippan þæs gæstes gryre agiefen weor 
þed · ufæn hit is enge ond hit is innan hat nis þat bet 
lic blod ac þær is brogan hyhst nenoht hýhtlic ham 
ac þær is helle grund sarlic sið fæt þa þe sibe 
ful oft tommældeð mid his muþe necon he þa mircan 
ge sceafht hu hi butan ende ece stondeð þam þe þær for 
his synnum onsægd⁴ weorþede · ond þonne ato ealdre or 
leg dreogeda⁵ · hya is þonne þæs forð gleaw oþþæ fela 
cunne þæt æfre mæge heofona⁶ heahþu⁷ gereccan swa 
georne þone godes dæl swa he gearo stondeð clænum heor 
tum þam þe þisne cwide willad ondreader þus deop 
ne · scealse dæg weorþan þæt we forð berað firena ge 
hwylce þeawas ondgeþohtas þæt bið þearlic gemot heardlic⁸ ·
here mægen hat biþacolod nebiþþonne onþisse worulde nym þe weatres sweg fisces ⁹ eþel ne biþ her ban neblod ac sceal bear na gehwylc mid lice ondmidsawle leanes fricgan ealles þæs þe we oneorþan ærge weorhtan ¹⁰ godes ofsþe ýfles nemæg næning gryre mare geweorþan æfter worulde ondsebið wide cuð ne týtaþ her tungal acbiþ týr scæcen eorþan blædas for þon ic á wille leode læran hi lof godes hergan on heah ðu hyhtum towuldre lîfgen ongeleafan ondalufan dryht nes wyrca In þisse worulde ærþon se wlonca dæg bodige þurh byman ¹¹ bryne hatne leg egsan ofer þrym ne bið ¹² næn ges eorles ¹³ tîr leng onþissum life sîþpan leohites weard o fer ¹⁴ ealne foldan fæþm fyr onsendeð lixeð lyfes mægen leg onetteð blæc byrnende blod gyte weorþed mongum ge meldad mægen cyninges þréa · beofað eal beorhte gesceaft brondas lacað onþam deoþan dæge dyneð up heofon · þonne weras ondwif woruld álætad eorþan ýrmþu seðð þonne oncece gewyrht · þonne bið gecyþed hwa inclænisse ¹⁵ lif alifde him bið lean gearo · hyht wæs á in heofnum sîþam user hæ lendes wæs middan geardes meotud þurh þa mæstan ge sceaft onful blacne beam bunden fæste cearian clomme crist ealle wat gode dæde no þæs gilpan þearf synfull sawel þæt hyre sie swegl ongean þonne hege hýrweð-
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fol oft halge lare brigdeð onbysmer necon he þæs brogan
dæl ýfles ondgiet ær hit hine onfealleð · heþæt þonne onfín
deð þonne se ðær cymeþ geond middan geard mongegum ge
cyþð þæt hebið on þæt wynstre weorð wyrs gesceadeñ
þonne he onþa swþran hond swican mote · leahtra alý
sed lyt þæt geþenceð seþe him wines glæd wilna bru
ceð sitþe him symbol gal síp ne bemurneð hu him
æfter þisse worulde weorðan mote :7

P I L e þonne forgieldan gæsta dryhten willum æf
ter þære wyrd wuldres ealdor · þam þe his synna
nusare ge þenceþ mod bysgunge micle dregoð him
þæt18 þonne ge leanað lifes waldend heofona hýrde æf
ter19 heonan siþe godum dædum þæs þe heswa geo
mor wearð sarig fore his synnum nesceal20 se to
sæne beon ne þissa larna to læt seþe him wile lifgan
mid gode brucan þæs boldes þeþ beorht fæder gear
wäð togeanes gæsta ealdor þæt is siþe dryhten þe
þone sele fræþweð timbreð þorhtlice tosculon clæ
ne womma lease sware waldend cwæð ealra cyninga
cyning forþan cwicra gewylc deop hydigra dryhtne
hýrde þara þe wile heofona heah þu ge stigan · hwæþre
þæt ge gongeð þeah þe hit sy greote beþealht lic21 mid
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lame þæt hit sceal life onfon · feores æfter foldan
folc bip gebonnen adames bearn ealle tospræce beoð
þonne ge gædrad gæst ondban sele · gesomnað to þam siðe
sop þæt wile cyðam þonne weus gemittað on þam mæstan
dæge rincas æt þære rode secgað þonne ryhta fela eal
swylyce under heofonum gewearð hates ondealedes godes oþ
þe ýfles georne gehyðerð heofon cyninga hýhst hæle
la dæde næfre mon þæs hlude horn aþyteð nebyman
ablaweþ þæt ne sy seo beorhte stefn ofer ealne mid
dan geard monnum hludre waldendes word wongas
beofiað forþam ærende þæt hetous eallum wat ·
on cweþ nu þis ne cwide cuþ sceal geweorðan þæt ic ge
wægan nemæg wyrd under heofonum · ac hit þus
gelimpan sceal leoda ge hwylcum ofer eall beorht
gesetu byrnende lig siþþan æfter þam lige lif bið
gestapelad welan ah inwulдре senu wel þenceð · 7

Age mec se ælmihta god
helpe min sehalga dryhten þuge sceope heofon
ondeorðan ondwundor eall min wundor cyning
þær onsindon ece dryhten micel ondmanig feald
ic þe mære god mine sawle bebode ondmines sylfes
lic ondmin word ondmin weorc witig dryhten ondeal
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min leoþo leohites hyrde ond pamanig feal
dan mine ge þohtas getacna me tunyla hyrde þær
selast sy sawle minre togemarcenne meotudes wil
lan þæt ic þe ge ðeo þinga gehwylce ondon me sylfum
soð fast cyning ræd árære regn þeof nelæt onseæ
de sceþpan þeah þe icscyppendum wuldor cyninge ·
waccor hyrde ricum dryhtne þonne minraed wære for
gifme to lisse lifgende god bitre bealo dæde ic þa bote
gemon cyninga wuldor cume to gif ic mot · forgif þume
min frea fiera ondondgiet ondgeþyl ondgemynd þinga ge
hwylces þara þume soðfæst cyning sendan wylle toçun
nunge nuþu27 const onmec firen dæda28 fela feorma mec
hwæþre meotod forþinre miltse þæh þe ic ma fre
mede grimra gylta þonne me god lyfde · hæbbe ic þonne
þæfe þæt ic þine se þeah halges heofon cyninges hylodo
ge tilge leorendum dagum lif æfter òþrum gesæ
onald sece þæt me sipþan þær unne arfæst god ecan
dreames29 lif alyfe30 þeah þe lætlicor bette bealo dæ
de þonne bibodu wæron halgan heofon lægnes hwæt
þume her fela forgeafe gesette mine hýht on þec
forhtæ fore þoncas þæt hio fæstlice stonde gesta
delad onstéþ mine hige gæsta god cyning ingearoneð
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raéd· Nuic fundige to þe fæder mon cynnes ofþisse
worulde nuic wat þæt ic sceal ful unfyr faca feormame
þonne wyrda waldend inþinne wuldor dream · ondmec geleo
ran laet leofra dryhten geoca mines gæstes þonne is
gromra tofela æfestum eaden hæbbe ic þonne æt
frean frofre þeah þe ic ær onfyrste lyt earnode arna
forlæt mec englas sêþah geniman onþinne neaþest
nergende cyning meotud for þinre miltse þeahðe
ic mana fela æfter dogrum dyde nelæt þumec næf
re deoful sêþah þinlim lædan onlaðne sið þylæs
hi on þone fore þonc gefeon motan þyþehy him sylfum
sellan þuhten englas ofer hydige þonng ece crist ge
lugon hy him æþam geleafan forþon hý longe scul
werge wihta wræce þrowian · for stond þu mec ondge
stýr him þonne storm cyme · minum gæste ongegn
goca þonne mihitg dryhten minre sawle gefreoþa
hýre ondge forma hy fæder moncynnes · hædre ge
hogode hæl ecegod meotod meaþtum wiþ min is
nuþa sefa synnum fah ondic ýmb sawle eom feam
siþum forht þeah þume fela sealde · arna on þisse
eorþan þesse ealles þonc meor da ondmiþsa þara
þume sealdest noðæs earninga ænige wæron mid

[***]
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hwæþre icme ealles þær ellen wylle habban ondhlyhhan
ondmehyhtan to frætwian mec onferþ weg ondfundian
sylf toþam siþe þeic asettan sceal gæst gærwan
ondme þæt eal forgode polian bliþe mode nu ic gebun
den eom fæste in minnum ferþe hurume frea wi
teð sume þara synna þe ic me sylf ne conn ongie
tan gleawlice gode ic hæbbie abolgen brego mon
cynnnes forþon ic þus bitter wearð gewit nad for[*]37
þisse worulde swa mingie wy[***]38 væron · micle fo
re monnum þæt ic mar[tir]dom39 deopne adreoge
ne eom ic dema gleaw wis fore weorude forþon ic þas
word spræce fus onferþe swa me onfrymðe gelomp
ýrmþu ofer eorpþan þæt ic ýpolade geara gehywlice
gode ealles þonc mod earfoþa ma þonne onþrum
fyrhto infolce forþon ic afysed eom earm ofminum
eþle nemæg þæs anhoga leod wynna40 leas leng drohtian
wine leas wæcca is him wrað meotud gnornað on
his geoguþe ondhim ælce mæle men fullestað ýcanð
his ýrmþu41 ondhe þæt eal þolað sar cwid secga ondhim
bið asefa geomor mod morgen seoc Ichime tylgust
secge þis sar spel ondýmb siþ spræce longunge fus
ndon lagu þence nat min hwy ic ge bycége bat onsæwe ·
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fleot onfarðe⁴² nah ic fela goldes nehuru þæs freondes þeme ge fylste toþam siðfate nuic me sylf nemæg fore minum won æhtum willan adreogan · Wudu mot him wexan wyrde bidan tanum lædan ic fortæle nemæg ænigne mon cynnes mode gelufian eorl on eple eala dryhten min meahtig mund bora þæt ic eom mode [se]oc⁴³ bitter abolgen Isseo bot æt þe gelong æfter [li]fe⁴⁴ ic on leohete nemæg butan earfo þum ængeþinga fea sceafht hæle foldan⁴⁵ [gew]unian⁴⁶ þonne icme tofremþum freo de hæfde cyð þu gecwe[me]⁴⁷ me ðæs á cearu symle lufena toleane swa ic alifde nugiet⁴⁸ biþ þæt þonne⁴⁹ mon him sylf nemæg wyrd onwendan þæt he þone wel þolige :7

[opening of Descent ll.1-15]
Codicological Annotation

The following notes were taken during an examination of the Exeter Book manuscript in 2007. They comprise observations on scribal corrections, damage to the manuscript, accent marks and so forth and provide agreement with, or supplementary manuscript information to that given in Muir (2000, Vol.1) for JDay1, ResA and ResB. Each entry corresponds to the endnote numbers found in the transcription of each poem, above. Lines numbers given refer to manuscript lines, not the lines of edited text.

Folio 116r
1 Line 5: l in gylpe appears to have a serif halfway along its ascender. This has been altered from a previous letter (most likely t).

2 Line 9: r in næfre has been written over an erased letter. The parchment under the letter is slightly rougher in texture (from scraping the folio to erase the previous letter) and the ink is fainter (due to writing on a parchment surface that has been thinned by correction).

3 Line 9: letters [i]ned in scined are a correction, written over an erasure. The parchment and ink quality are as with the previous erasure.

4 Line 16: g in onsæged is written over an erasure.

5 Line 17: the letters ed in dreogeð are written over an erasure.

6 Line 18: second o in heofona has been corrected from a. The original tail of a touches the following n. Deleting the tail has left a larger than usual space between the two letters (3mm as opposed to the approx. average of 1mm (as between n and the following a). Measurements my own).

7 Line 18: second h in heahþu is over an erased letter that previously had a descender (the parchment is worn and discoloured due to the correction).

8 Line 22: the letters of heardlic are smaller than the rest of the text to fit on the folio; spacing between this word and the previous word is smaller (2mm as opposed to the usual 3mm).
Folio 116v

9 Line 2: the fisces of fisces eþel appears to be in a slightly lighter shade of ink (more brown than black c.f. the rest of the text). Spacing around both words appears larger. Whether very slight difference in colour is due to the scribe taking a break/refilling his nib with ink is unclear, though it is of interest that scholars in their translation of the poem take offence at this variation on wætres (c.f. Shippey 1976) or say that it is evident some text has been lost (c.f. Muir 2000). Following the alliteration pattern of the text it would appear a half line is missing before fisces eþel though whether this is deliberate or not is debatable (see Linguistic Notes, above). Shippey fills this gap in his translation with phrasing similar to that used at the start of the poem and elsewhere in Old English poetry (see Shippey for details). However, I find this unnecessary – nothing is lost in sense or meaning and the image of the waters as the ‘home of the fish’, while a little out of character for the description of water in the poem, does not cause issue. Cf Muir’s notes to l. 23 of ResB: gnornad on his gegufhe where he states: ‘Though the b-verse is wanting here, the sense of the passage in complete’ (2000: 339). Similarly, though it appears at least a half-line of edited text is missing in JDayI at this point, the sense is complete. Spacing before fisces and after eþel is 4mm which could be indicative of a pause in copying on behalf of the scribe and subsequent scribal eye-skip is a possibility.

10 Line 4: second e in geweortan is expuncted (indicated by a dot below the letter to indicate deletion).

11 Line 10: y in byman has been corrected from i.

12 Line 10: bið is written over an erasure.

13 Line 11: one letter before eorles has been erased. It appears to have had an ascender (wearing and discolouration of parchment indicates this).

14 Line 11: the final o of this line belongs with the fer of the next line (ofer) – the scribe has perhaps realised ofer would not fit onto l. 11 in full and so has attempted to fill the gap with the first letter of the word, rather than write ofer out in full on the next line, or reduce spacing on l. 11 to accommodate it. This still leaves a gap, however, and is unusual practice in these three poems; while words are often split over line breaks, this appears to be the only occasion in JDayI, ResA and ResB where a single letter of a word (particularly the opening letter) is separated from the remainder of the word in this way. C.f. the layout and spacing of nebyman on l. 8 of f.117v which has been reduced in size to fit the remaining space of the line.

15 Line 17: the letters ni of cleannisse is over an erased letter. The erasure appears to have been completed after the page was written as m in heofunum (l. 18, below) is also slightly affected/worn by this correction.
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16 Line 4: second e of gesceaden is expuncted.

17 Line 9: punctuation :? indicates the scribe thought the poem ended here, or as, argued above, indicates the close of a section of the poem. The Type 2a littera notabilior wynn is another indicator of this – usually marking the beginning of a new poem. However, compare this with section divisions in Husb and the initial A of ResA which, while enlarged, isn’t decorated at all. I and L of wile are also capitalised – 7mm in height each, another indicator of the start of a section of importance in this text. See Section IV for discussion of this division.

18 Line 12: the descender of þ in þæt has been lost due to fire damage.

19 Lines 12/13: t in æfter is slightly faded by fire damage.

20 Line 14: e in sceal is over an erasure.

21 Line 22: l in lic has been altered from i. The remains of a serif are still visible; the foot of l has been extended (indicated by a change in ink colour).

Folio 117v

22 Line 1: there is a space after foldan (16mm). The parchment is rough here, though not from an erasure of any kind, which is perhaps why it has been left (c.f. Muir 2000: 334). However, the same rough patch extends into the line below and is used by the scribe; there appears to be no reason for leaving the blank space.

23 Line 7: the letters hst of hyhst could be over an erasure (see Muir) though the MS along this side of the parchment is rough. There is some slight discolouration that could indicate an erasure.

24 Line 8: byman in nebyman appears slightly reduced in size (to fit the folio) and the word slopes from the ruled line down to the right. Cf. the layout and spacing of ofer on l. 11 of f.116v.
Folio 118r

25 Line 1: the scribe has left a blank space at the end of this line (45mm); this falls in the middle of a word *fealdan* which makes the space unusual. There doesn’t appear to be any roughness on the parchment that could explain the gap. Cf. l. 1 of f.117v where a similar practice occurs. Also see l. 11 of f.116v and l. 8 of f.117v for examples and discussion of unusual spacing.

26 Line 2: *geþohtas* is written over a rough area of parchment giving the appearance it has been re-written in full over an erasure (which it has not). The *a* in *geþohtas* only appears to have been corrected from *u* as it is narrower in construction than the usual formation of *a* in this hand.

27 Line 12: *þ* in *þu* has been corrected from a wynn by adding an ascender – the original serif of the wynn is still visible on the ascender.

28 Line 12: *r* in *firendaeda* has been corrected from *n*. The base of the first minim of the original *n* is still visible to the right of the descender of *r*.

29 Line 18: second *e* of *dreames* is over an erasure.

30 Line 18: *e* in *alyfe* is over an erasure. Also, the tongue of *e* on the newly roughened parchment extends further to the right than usual with a blunt, less tapered edge than is usually found in this hand. C.f. *e* in *pe* in l. 13 – this may well be to fill the following space.

31 Line 13: *scul* should read *sculon* but the final two letters are obscured by fire damage. The word appears very close to the right margin, despite the fire damage. The *-on* was most likely represented as an abbreviation: a single letter with a macron (c.f. Muir 2000: 338).

32 Line 16: an ascender has been erased from above *g* in *mihtig*. The remains of the ascender are still visible on the horizontal stroke of *g*.

33 Line 21: a letter has been erased between *r* and *d* in *meorda*. 
Folio 119r

34 Line 1: there appears to be a tiny dot above a in hlyhan; however, this appears to be a natural mark on the parchment, rather than a deliberate mark by the scribe.

35 Line 4: o in forgode has been changed from e. The cross-stroke/tongue of e has been scraped away.

36 Lines 5/6: ð in witeð has been changed from d. A crossbar has been added to the ascender of d. The ascender also curves more to the left like the formation of d in this hand, than the usual formation of ð.

37 Line 8: only the descender of r in for is visible due to fire damage.

38 Line 9: i in giewyrhto is expuncted. Only the top strokes of rht of gewyrhto are visible due to fire damage.

39 Line 10: almost the entire t in martirdom is lost and the medial letters ir are also no longer visible, due to fire damage.

40 Line 16: a in leodynna is altered from e, the tongue of e having been scraped away to produce a.

41 Line 19: the first minim of m in yrmþu is written over an erased letter, which had both an ascender and a descender (possibly p) suggesting an eye-skip by the scribe.

Folio 119v

42 Line 1: ð in faroðe has been altered from d; a crossbow has been added to the ascender of the original d.

43 Line 7: the se of [se]oc has been damaged; only a small trace of the top of e is visible.

44 Line 8: the li of [li]fe has been obscured by damage; only the descender and part of the crossbow of f are visible.

45 Line 9: n in foldan is slightly damaged.

46 Line 9: the gew of gewunian is obscured; the tip of the wynn is (barely) visible, but still remains.
47 Line 10: the *eme of gecweme* is obscured by damage. Only the outer line of the lower lobe of the first *e* is visible.

48 Line 11: the *et of giet* is still visible but the tops of the letters are obscured by damage.

49 Line 11: the *...ð þæt þon of bið þæt þonne* is obscured by a dark stain.
Conclusion

Exeter Cathedral Library MS 3501 is a ‘unique poetical anthology’ in range and variety (Pope: 1978: 25). Not only is it an anthology of individual poems, but ‘a collection of poetical arrangements, configurations and sequences such as the Riddles, the Christ sequence and the bestiaries. In other words, the Exeter codex is a composite of miniature compositions of which the individual poems can be seen as parts’ (Lochrie 1986b: 323). To this collection we may now add the conceptual unit of *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB*.

Summary

This thesis has shown that manuscript context and paratextual information are pivotal in the interpretation and editorial practice of Old English texts. An analysis of textual division markers in the Exeter Book provides evidence *JDayI* and *ResA/B* were placed together deliberately by the compiler. By examining conceptual groups of texts in other Anglo-Saxon manuscripts (namely CCCC 201 and the Vercelli Book) I have shown that the compilation of texts such as *JDayI* and *ResA/B* was not uncommon; further, the poems can also be understood to work within a larger group of texts within the manuscript, each relating to the Easter season and similar to the compilation of *JDayII – GloriaI* in CCCC 201. Together, this evidence is indicative of a textual tradition of grouping texts to inspire compunction and aid confessional practice. Using evidence of the textual grouping of *VercHomXIX-XXI*, I have argued the compilation of *JDayI* and *ResA/B* was inspired by homilies used during Rogationtide which detail Judgement Day, penance and the story of Jonah, each identifiable in the three poems.

Section I: Methodology outlined the rationale for a new edition, examination and analysis of *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB*. In so doing, it discussed various editorial approaches and questioned the editorial practice of abstracting Old English texts from their manuscript context. By engaging with scholarship relating to digital editing and the rationale of hypertext, where the resulting
edition or resource is often designed to be user-centric, it proposed that by exploiting advances in
digital imagery, the print edition could be reimagined so that the relationship between manuscript
and print edition was transparent to the reader: this reimagining is reflected in Section V: Transcription.

Section II: Thematic Evidence provided this fresh analysis and review of criticism for *JDayI*,
*ResA* and *ResB* as individual texts. Each poem has previously been subject to the constraints of a
particular genre (Judgement Day poetry and elegy); subsequently, the poems had each met with
some undue criticism when it was found they did not adequately meet the requirements of that
genre. The analysis of *JDayI* has shown that rather than being classed as a Judgement Day poem
which did not adequately detail the events of the Last Judgement, the poem is better understood
within the context of wisdom literature, where the purpose of the poet is to address the topic of
Doomsday as it appears to humankind. The poem’s function is to inspire mental self-examination
that leads to compunction. The poet’s purpose therefore, is to inspire this meditation and to
promote action which will aid care for the soul. The analysis of *ResA/B* detailed the complex
critical history of the two poems and the current split in modern scholarship. Though the
codicological findings of Frantzen/Bliss (1976) have done much to advance scholarship of the
poems’ intention and purpose, recent scholarship can be divided into two extremes: interpreting
the poems individually, with no reference to its counterpart; or arguing for textual unity between
each part with no or little reference to the codicological evidence. While each method of analysis
has its merits, they have yet to be reconciled; this section contributed to this reconciliation. By
analysing the poems within their manuscript context, I have shown that they share much in
common, not only with each other, but with other poems in the Exeter Book. In particular, they
can be understood as variations on the theme of spiritual despair: *ResA* despair of the sinful but
penitent soul and *ResB* despair of the soul ignorant of his sins and the means by which he can
achieve salvation. By analysing the poems individually, I maintain that they are individual works
which can be understood on their own terms. However, this thesis has also shown that much can
be learned of their function within the manuscript by examining their manuscript context and
investigating the purpose of their manuscript compilation.
Section III: Contextual Evidence brought together the thematic analysis of Section II to argue for 
*JDayI, ResA* and *ResB* as a conceptual unit. It provided a context for this by examining *JDayII – GlorI* in CCCC 201, shown previously to function as a unit in that manuscript. In so doing, it showed that manuscript compilation such as that argued for *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB* (and indeed for *JDayI – HomFrII*) was not uncommon, and that existence of these units is indicative of a textual tradition which brought together texts previously unrelated to serve a new purpose. Section III argued that this purpose was to inspire compunction and lead the audience to a state of mental awareness of sins; this in turn would promote confession and penance. By examining *VercHomXIX-XXI*, this section provided a theological context for such practice, and supported the argument for the compilation of *JDayI, ResA* and *ResB* as a unit. Further, it provided evidence for the argument that the manuscript compiler of the Exeter Book brought the three poems together, influenced by themes he recognised in them which reflected those of Rogationtide homilies.

Section IV: Manuscript Evidence provided an investigation of the textual division practices employed throughout the Exeter Book to divide and subdivide poems. Prompted by the use of both decorated and undecorated *litterae notabiliores* in the division of *JDayI* and *ResA*, I collected and analysed data which revealed the size and decoration of *litterae notabiliores* combined with the distribution of mixed majuscules did in fact reveal a textual hierarchy being used throughout the manuscript. Case studies I-IV provided an analysis of the division and subordination practices found in four other Exeter Book poems: *ChrIII, Deor, Husb*, and *SouI*. By analysing the relationship between textual division, textual hierarchy and literary structure and interpretation of the texts, I was able to show that the division and subordination between *JDayI* and *ResA* revealed these three poems could indeed be read as a unit, where the *littera notabilior* of *ResA* was shown to function as denoting a subsection within a larger unit. A complete spreadsheet of results is included as Appendix I to this thesis.

Section V (below) provides a transcription of all three poems, the layout of which reflects the manuscript context of each poem, and supports a reading of all three as a unit. It offers a facing
facsimile and diplomatic transcription to convey to the reader each stage of abstraction, from
manuscript to print, involved in the editorial process. A diplomatic transcription has been
provided in the belief that modern editorial practices (though necessary) can often obscure or
misrepresent the original manuscript evidence.

Original Contribution
Overall, the thesis makes an original contribution to scholarship by:

1. examining the textual division and subordination practice used throughout the Exeter
   Book manuscript
2. identifying a hierarchy within these data based on the size and decoration of litterae
   notabiliorese combined with distribution of mixed majuscules
3. analysing these data in relation to the literary structure of texts from each of the four
   Groups of poems in the manuscript
4. combining this thematic and manuscript evidence to offer a new interpretation of JDayI
   and ResA/B
5. highlighting the importance of manuscript context in the interpretation, analysis and
   editorial practice of Old English poetry.

Beyond this, the thesis offers a fresh analysis of three poems, previously misrepresented,
misunderstood or constrained by their genre classification and provides an interpretative
approach which reconciles previous scholarship of the poems (ResA/B in particular). By
providing evidence of manuscript compilation, I have argued that rather than being a miscellany
of Old English poetry, the poems at this point in the Exeter Book display evidence of wider
textual practice also present in CCCC 201. This in turn is suggestive of either the needs of, or the
ideals for, the community which produced the manuscript.
Methodological Implications

With these contributions in mind, there are also a number of methodological implications which accompany such an investigation. These include the following:

1. Due to the limitations in size of this thesis, an analysis of the textual division and hierarchy used throughout the *Riddles* of the Exeter Book was not possible. Analysis of division markers therefore had to be constrained to the poetic portions of the manuscript (that is, Groups 1, 2 and 4, detailed in Section IV)
2. Equally, a transcription and analysis in full of the poems which form part of the wider thematic group described in Section IV, that is, *Desc – HomFriI* was also not possible.
3. In order to undertake this study, each text of the manuscript was understood as it has most recently been edited (Muir 2000), which of course brings with it the issue that the division of the manuscript’s contents into individual poems is understood as prescribed by early scholars.
4. As detailed in Section IV, any interpretation of manuscript evidence such as order of texts in a manuscript, or a supposed development in practice of textual division and subordination, must be made with care as the current compilation of the manuscript may not reflect the original order.¹ These results need to be understood in the context of textual division practice found in other Old English manuscripts (detailed in Section IV).
5. There also remains the possibility that any design of layout or division of texts may have been influenced by an exemplar.²
6. While the theory of a conceptual unit is here presented to assist an appreciation of manuscript compilation and its impact on textual interpretation, it is not intended to detract from the fact that originally *JDayI*, *ResA/B* were individually composed poems, which on their own had perhaps a quite different purpose assigned to that argued in this thesis.³

Future Research Directions

Each of the methodological implications outlined above offers a basis for future research. In order to fully understand the textual division practice in the Exeter Book, an analysis of the *Riddles* would be beneficial; additionally case studies for each poem of the manuscript would

---

¹ I believe I have dealt with this limitation sufficiently in Section IV; a study of the gatherings of the manuscript show *JDayI*, *ResA* and *ResB* were always found together. Equally, had the manuscript been composed in booklets (as suggested by Conner 1992), the poems would still be found in their current order.
² Case Study IV addresses this issue by examining the similarities in layout between one of the Exeter Book poems which survives in another manuscript: *SouII* (surviving as *SouI* in the Vercelli Book).
³ However, it is their function in the present manuscript which is analysed here as reflective of practice at the time of manuscript compilation, rather than an investigation into original purpose at the time of original composition.
offer an in-depth analysis of the division and subdivision in each individual text. In order that this present study was possible, each text of the manuscript was understood as it has most recently been edited (Muir 2000); this understanding brings with it division of the manuscript’s contents into individual poems as prescribed by early scholars. Use of Muir (2000) as a modern edition of the manuscript was necessary so that divisional practice could by analysed and organised in a coherent way. One avenue of future research would be to use these data to analyse the original editorial practice of the manuscript which divided the contents into individual texts; this analysis could reveal other sequences, arrangements and conceptual units of texts. The starting point for this study was Cavill’s analysis of the sectional divisions of Old English manuscripts (1985, results of which are supplied in Appendix III). However, Cavill limited his study to the longer Old English poems (of which JDayI and ResA/B, for example, were not part).

A further development of the research presented in this thesis would be to use the present methodology of analysing litterae notabiliores to continue Cavill’s work to all Old English manuscripts and their contents. This research could then offer a point of comparison between Old English manuscripts, but could also help inform divisional practice found in later manuscripts and those transferred into Early Modern print editions of medieval texts.

Envoi

When one begins research of an Old English poem for the first time, the edition, anthology or genre study may well provide the first encounter with a particular text, and yet, each print edition of an Old English poem brings with it particular editorial biases or a specific rationale which in turn affects one’s perception and interpretation of that poem. Modern print editions often do not include a facsimile image of the manuscript page, and neither do they always provide information relating to the manuscript context of the text or texts in question. Manuscript evidence and manuscript context have always been important to the study of Old English poetry, but the realisation of this importance has grown recently as an increasing number of manuscripts are being digitised. What has often been un-visible in print editions, anthologies and genre studies is now more visible than ever before; we are now able to view the very object which was always intended to be seen: the manuscript itself. This thesis has shown how codicological and paratextual information can be crucial to an interpretation of Old English poetry, and for one to
uncover the original intentions of the compiler who brought these poems together. By providing an analysis of JDayI, ResA and ResB in their manuscript context, this thesis contributes to the on-going study of manuscripts, texts, codicology and paratext, and to the scholarship of the Exeter Book. It is hoped the contributions outlined in this work will lead, where possible, to future research and methodologies which, in turn, will help extend our knowledge of the original compilation, intended function and design of the most famous Old English manuscript: the Exeter Book.
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Appendices

Appendix I: *Litterae Notabilires* in Groups 1, 2 and 4 of the Exeter Book

Appendix II: Punctuation and Spacing in Groups 1, 2 and 4 of the Exeter Book

Appendix III: Sectional Divisions in Old English Manuscript (Cavill 1985: 157)
Appendix I: *Litterae Notabiliores* in Groups 1, 2 and 4 of the Exeter Book

<p>| POEM          | GROUP ONE | 5r        | 15r       | 25r       | 35r       | 45r       | 55r       | 65r       | 75r       | 85r       | 95r       | 105r      | 115r      | 125r      | 135r      | 145r      | 155r      | 165r      | 175r      | 185r      | 195r      |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| <em>Chvi</em>        |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
| (Advent       |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
| <em>Lyric</em> 1-12 |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
| <em>Chvi</em>        |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
| (Ascension)   |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
| <em>Chvi</em>        |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
| (Christ in    |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
| Judgement)    |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
| <em>Culm</em>        |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
| GROUP FOUR | Wife's Lament f.115r |  |  | Y | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| JDav | f.115v | • |  | Y | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| f.117r | • |  | Y | 2 |  |
| Resignation A f.117v |  | • | Y | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Resignation B f.119r |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Descent f.119v | • |  | Y | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Almsgiving f.121v | • |  | Y | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Pharao f.122r | • |  | Y | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Lord's Prayer I f.122r | • |  | Y | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| HornFrag f.122r | • |  | Y | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Husband f.123r | • |  | Y | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| f.123r | • |  | Y | 0 |  |
| f.123r | • |  | Y | 0 |  |
| Ruin f.123v | • |  | Y | 0 | 1 | 0 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem</th>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Punctuation</th>
<th>Spacing</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advent Lyric 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advent Lyric 6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advent Lyric 8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>½ last line blank</td>
<td>No blank line between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advent Lyric 10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advent Lyric 12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChrI</td>
<td>(.77-9) f.16r</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.160-1) f.16v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>½ blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChrII</td>
<td>(.246-7) f.17v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 word on last line f.17v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.339-40) f.19r</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>half last line blank</td>
<td>No blank line between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final line</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.7 .7 .7</td>
<td>2 blank lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChrIII</td>
<td>(l.198-8) f.23v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.214-5) f.23v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 word on last line f.23v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.393-3) f.26v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>½ blank line</td>
<td>No blank line between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.595-4) f.27v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td>No blank line between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.695-7) f.28v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>½ blank line</td>
<td>No blank line between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.965-3) f.39v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td>No blank line between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>final line f.32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 blank lines at bottom of folio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GuthA</td>
<td>1.405-6 f.33v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 word on last line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.109-70 f.35v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.291-2 f.36v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 ½ words on line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.409-4 f.36v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 word on line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.509-30 f.49v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.617-8 f.49v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.721-2 f.49v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 word on line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final line</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.7 .7 .7</td>
<td>3 blank lines</td>
<td>one word at end of 1st blank line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GuthB</td>
<td>1.75-9 f.45v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.157-8 f.47v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>½ blank line</td>
<td>No blank line bwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.241-2 f.48v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.315-16 f.49v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>½ blank line</td>
<td>No blank line bwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.405-6 f.59v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.430-7 f.59v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cant</td>
<td>1.72-3 f.60v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>½ blank line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final line</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.7 .7 .7</td>
<td>1 word on line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>1.84-5 f.57v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>½ blank line</td>
<td>No blank line bwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.181-2 f.58v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.784-5 f.59v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.343-40 f.60v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>end of line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.425-4 f.67v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 word on line</td>
<td>begins on new folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.517-8 f.63v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.594-9 f.64v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final line</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.7 .7 .7</td>
<td>1 blank line</td>
<td>22 line folio/new folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>Folio</td>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>Spacing</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPl</td>
<td>final line 111 112</td>
<td>:?</td>
<td>2 words on line</td>
<td>No blank line shown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HomFragl</td>
<td>final line 110</td>
<td>Fire damage. Appears to be :?</td>
<td>2/3 blank line</td>
<td>Obscured by fire damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rd30b</td>
<td>final line 19 122v</td>
<td>:?</td>
<td>1/3 blank line at start of Rd300 (see JDay &amp; col)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rd30b</td>
<td>final line 17 1123</td>
<td>:?</td>
<td>1 word on line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jrlb</td>
<td>1 12 11 123</td>
<td>:?</td>
<td>2 words on line</td>
<td>No blank line shown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jrlb</td>
<td>1 12 12 123</td>
<td>:?</td>
<td>2 words on line</td>
<td>No blank line shown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jrlb</td>
<td>final line 12 123v</td>
<td>:?</td>
<td>1/3 blank line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain</td>
<td>final line 149 124v</td>
<td>Fire damage</td>
<td>1 word visible at end of blank line</td>
<td>Fire damage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Punctuation and Spacing in Groups 1, 2 and 4 of the Exeter Book
Appendix III: Sectional Divisions in Old English Manuscript (Cavill 1985: 157)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Poems</th>
<th>Section Minimum</th>
<th>Section Maximum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Sectional Divisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis A</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5,5, 32, 4, 36, 7, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis B (V)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>4, 44, 48, 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ and Mary</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosea</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1321</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosea</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosea</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosea</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahum</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zephania</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>